

JPRS-UPA-89-010  
7 FEBRUARY 1989



---

# ***JPRS Report***

# **Soviet Union**

---

***Political Affairs***

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-010

### CONTENTS

7 FEBRUARY 1989

#### PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Method of Choosing People's Deputies From Party Examined [T. Ivanova; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 14 Jan 89]	1
Smolensk Obkom Plenum Discussed, First Secretary Re-Elected [V. Tsybulskiy; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 14 Jan 89]	3
Irkutsk Obkom Plenum Objectively Assessed, First Secretary Re-Elected [V. Ivashkovskiy, V. Fomin; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 12 Jan 89]	5
Kostroma Oblast Party Conference Re-Elects First Secretary [M. Ovcharov; IZVESTIYA, 12 Dec 88]	7
Tyumen Delegates Vote Against First Secretary [I. Ognev, Ye. Khokhlov; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 23 Dec 88]	9
Okrug Election Commission Head Outlines Pre-Election Activities [E. Vrublevskiy; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 25 Dec 88]	11
Donetsk Oblast Conference Highlights Reorganization, Economy [G. Dorofeyev; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 22 Dec 88]	13
Estonian SSR December Supsov Session Speeches	14
Ryuytel on USSR Supsov Decisions [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 10 Dec 88]	14
Pyldroos on Status of Estonian Language [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 9 Dec 88]	17
Krasnodar Officials Discuss Reform of Party Apparatus [K. Aksenov; PRAVDA, 21 Dec 88]	20
BSSR CP CC Prepares for CPSU CC Nationalities Plenum [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 18 Dec 88]	23
Election Results of BSSR Obkom Plenums Reported [SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 25 Dec 88]	24

#### MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

Printing Paper Production Problems Persist; Shortfalls Predicted [N. Morozov, N. Istominskiy; PRAVDA, 17 Dec 88]	25
Researcher Cautions Media Against Thematic Overkill, Overemphasis on Readers' Letters [N.V. Kostenko; RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 11 Nov 88]	25
ZNAMYA Editor's Comments on 1989 Periodical Subscription Controversy [ZNAMYA No 11, Nov 88]	26

#### HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Creation of Soviet Latvia 1918-1919, Attendant Changes in Republic Discussed [A. Biron; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 17 Dec 88]	29
Historian Affirms Distinction Between Romanian, Moldavian Cultures [N. Babilunga; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 17 Dec 88]	32
More Letters on Khrushchev, Stalin, Brezhnev [OGONEK No 48, Nov 88]	37
Soviet Attendance at International Conference on Philosophy Noted [A. Antonov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 4 Nov 88]	39

#### RELIGION

LaSSR Council for Religious Affairs Official on New Church Law, Other Issues [A. Kublinskis; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 9 Dec 88]	41
Priest Claims Social Needs of Clergy Are Ignored [P. Adelgym; OGONEK No 47, 19-26 Nov 88]	43
Bratsk Believers Given Church After Numerous Requests [V. Monakhov; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 13 Dec 88]	44
Believers Win Battle in Request for Registration, Church [PRAVDA UKRAINY, 11 Dec 88]	44
Book Examines Protestant Sects in Chuvashskaya ASSR [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 25 Jan 89]	44
USSR, U.S. Jewish Cultural Committees Sign Agreement [Ye. Khanga; MOSCOW NEWS No 2, 15-22 Jan 88]	45

Seventh Day Adventists Perform Charitable Work [M. Smirnov; MOSCOW NEWS No 2, 15-22 Jan 88]	45
Church, LiSSR Temperance Society Collaborate on Children's Charity [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 30 Dec 88]	46

## SOCIAL ISSUES

Estonian Official Defends Republic Komsomol [T. Veersalu; SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 16 Dec 88]	47
Voronezh, Tula Conflict Between Youth Newspaper Journalists, Komsomol [D. Muratov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 4 Dec 88]	48
BSSR Notes Sharp Increase in Robberies [G. A. Krukovskiy; SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, 3 Dec 88]	49
KGB Counterespionage Mission Unchanged [V. M. Prilukov; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 27 Dec 88]	50
Abuses of Former MVD Chief Shchelokov Detailed [Ye. Dodolev; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 7 Dec 88]	50

## REGIONAL ISSUES

Democratic Union Said To Advocate 'Liquidation of USSR' [N. Korsakov; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 9 Dec 88]	54
1989 Census Aims at Clarifying Nationalities Statistics [S. Bruk; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 24 Dec 88]	55
Split at Estonian Labor Collectives Conference Described [V. Ivanov, A. Podvezko; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 2 Dec 88]	56
Heads of Rival Estonian Labor Collectives Groups Interviewed [Y. Nugis, V. Yarovoy; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 16 Dec 88]	60
LPF Protests Distorted Description of Members' Visit to USA [PADOMJU JAUNATNE, 16 Dec 88]	63
Interfront Draft Statutes Published [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 2 Dec 88]	63
Latvian People's Forum Resolutions	66
Political Sovereignty and Economic Independence [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 15 Dec 88]	66
Ecological Situation [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 15 Dec 88]	67
National Cultural Development of National and Ethnic Groups [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 15 Dec 88]	69
Workers' Involvement in Lithuanian Sajudis Urged [N. Belyayeva; MOSCOW NEWS No 52, 1-8 Jan 89]	70
Pros, Cons of Lithuania's Yedinstvo Movement Debated [M. Burokyavichyus; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 1 Dec 88]	72
Groups for Supporting Lithuania's Yedinstvo Movement Formed [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 8 Dec 88]	75
Renewed Efforts Needed To Preserve Siberian Languages [A. Derevyanko, Ye. Ubryatova, et al.; PRAVDA, 24 Dec 88]	75
Moldavian as Official Language Would 'Violate Linguistic Equality' [V. Yakovlev; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 1 Dec 88]	77
Ukrainian Language Society Formed in Ternopol [V. Nazarchuk; RABOCHAYA GAZETA, 28 Dec 88]	80
Charges Brought Against Leaders of BSSR's Martirolog Society [A. Mostovshchikov; MOSCOW NEWS No 52, 1-8 Jan]	80
Newspaper Conducts Survey on 1933 Ukrainian Famine [S. Kulchytsky; SILSKI VISTI, 9 Dec 88]	82



**Method of Choosing People's Deputies From Party Examined**

18000403a Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian 14 Jan 89 p 1

[Interview with T. Ivanova, deputy chairman of the CPSU Electoral Commission for the Election of People's Deputies, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, by Yu. Nikolayev: "Candidates from the Party"; date and place not specified]

[Text] [Nikolayev]: Tatyana Georgiyevna. It seems that little time has elapsed since the CPSU Central Committee plenum at which candidates from the CPSU were nominated as candidate USSR people's deputies, but many letters have already arrived at the editorial offices...

[Ivanova]: There is nothing surprising in that. For as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized in the opening words of his report, that plenum has no precedent in our party's history. Hence also the natural desire of readers of the newspaper to learn more details about it. And they are asking us in the electoral commission about the principles used in compiling the lists of USSR people's deputies from the CPSU, and who went onto that list and what sort of election platform the party had...

[Nikolayev]: Today, when the CPSU Central Committee Appeal "To the Party and the Soviet People" has been published in the press, and everyone has the right to judge the election platform of the communists, our task and yours is simpler. It is, therefore, better to deal with the makeup of the candidates from the CPSU.

[Ivanova]: In the days immediately ahead, under established legal procedure the registration of candidate deputies will have been completed and the list will also be published. And I hope that the makeup of delegates from the CPSU to the upcoming Congress of People's Deputies will satisfy the public. First and foremost because it is made up primarily of communists who enjoy high authority not only in their own labor collectives, cities and villages but also throughout the country, and have, without exaggeration, received national recognition. Let me name just some of them. Miner Vladimir Gvozdev, corn grower Mikhail Klepikov, innovators in medical science and practical workers Svyatoslav Fedorov and Gavriil Ilizarov, academicians Leonid Abalkin and Guriy Marchuk, writers Vasilii Belov and Daniil Granin... Tell me, who does not know those names?

[Nikolayev]: Notwithstanding, what criteria were used for the final selection of those given the cherished mandates? It would probably be no simple matter to single them out from the 31,500 initial nominations made by the primary party organizations.

[Ivanova]: When I am asked about this I usually advise people to read the lines of the report at the plenum where it talks about the acute need to shift the center of gravity to practical work to realize the ideas of perestroika and the role of the party as the organizing and integrating force in society. There is the answer. I think that when submitting for discussion the list of candidate USSR people's deputies, the Central Committee Politburo was also guided by precisely this. The popularity of comrades among the masses and people's trust in them were also taken into consideration.

[Nikolayev]: Incidentally, could you tell us the names at least of the most popular candidates, and, consequently, the real leaders of perestroika?

[Ivanova]: Why not. But first let us turn to the so-called lists Nos 1 and 2. The first list (207 people) contains the candidates nominated by the primary party organizations and rayon (or city) party committees and the obkoms, kraykoms and central committees of the union republics. The second list was drawn up from proposals submitted directly to the CPSU Central Committee from the party organizations, labor collectives and individuals. As is known, in all about 12,000 telegrams, letters and written applications from meetings were received. Most of them concerned our recognized party leaders. For example, in 6,157 cases M.S. Gorbachev was named as first secretary. The name of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and other members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and central committee secretaries were also mentioned. But not only them. For there are 312 names on the second list. And, perhaps what is most remarkable, the coincidence of, say, the official and the unofficial candidates. And I am not talking about only central committee leaders. In order to clarify this, let me refer to the "meeting" in the lists of comrades who are well known to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA readers, using statements made about them and their own statements. For example, Ivan Afanasyevich Vasilyev was nominated as a CPSU candidate for the post of USSR deputy by the Pskov party obkom. He was also named by the authors of many letters and telegrams and decisions adopted at meetings. Exactly the same thing happened with Mikhail Grigoryevich Vagin, the chairman of a kolkhoz in Gorkiy Oblast, and with many, many others.

In my opinion, the two channels complement each other nicely.

[Nikolayev]: And how do the delegates look on the whole in terms of age and social affiliation?

[Ivanova]: Some 17 people are aged from 21 to 40, and 58 are aged from 41 to 60. As you can see, a majority of our candidates are people at the height of their powers, ready for great state work. There are also veterans and communists, greatly needed today for perestroika.



Now, social affiliation. The candidates include 33 workers from industry and construction and 14 from agriculture (including 26 workers and 7 kolhoz farmers). And this is quite regular. For our party was also born as the party of the working class, and today also it reflects the vital interests of the broadest masses of workers.

The candidates include 8 scientific workers and 10 cultural figures, and two representatives of public health and two of national education... As you see, in general the priority indisputably lies with the party aktiv and not the apparatus.

[Nikolayev]: Tatyana Georgiyevna. One of the questions most often asked is the following: but why was it that at the plenum not only the members of the central committee but also the members of the CPSU Auditing Commission and also the secretaries of obkoms and kraykoms and of the central committees of the union republics took part in the voting?

[Ivanova]: That is what the plenum decided. And this is quite logical, especially when you consider that there has recently been a major renewal of cadres at the local level. The party leadership in a number of regions is not yet represented in the central committee, and they do represent enormous party masses. How could they be bypassed during the elections.

[Nikolayev]: Another question that is often asked: the practice of offering alternative choices has now spread everywhere, but the central committee plenum nominated exactly 100 candidates for the 100 seats... Why were there no alternative choices?

[Ivanova]: I, perhaps, would not have posed the question in this way. Remember that during the initial stage there were more than 30,000 candidates. As I have already explained, the plenum was guided primarily by considerations of whoever was the most capable of the proposed comrades, and whoever promotes perestroika most persistently and most purposefully, and follows the party line in the highest body of state power.

Here we should evidently also clarify the following. I am often asked, for example, how the voting for the final choice of candidates and for the central elected bodies of other organizations should be approached. Quite differently! Each of them has the right to devise and apply its own procedure for nominating candidates, voting and so forth. One thing is not permitted: deviation from the law on elections.

And, of course, it is also not permitted for any group interests to take over in these organizations, or to replace consideration of arguments "for" and "against" with outbursts of emotion or ambition. In my opinion, the writer Vladimir Karpov noted very accurately one fundamental feature of the plenum. It was proposed that the "100" of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo would include representatives of various trends in science, the

arts, and economics, sometimes contradictory trends, and the plenum supported this approach. And this is certainly right if we seriously want to effect democratization in the life of society.

[Nikolayev]: Some of our readers are interested in knowing what will happen if at the CPSU Central Committee plenum that conducts the elections any of the candidates nominated fails to get the necessary number of votes. Will those mandates remain unfilled if this occurs?

[Ivanova]: There is no need for concern on this score. First, each candidate has been discussed personally and if any challenge was issued against him it would already have been investigated. Second, it would not be a tragedy if a candidate still failed to get the necessary number of votes. The plenum has the right to offer the unfilled mandate to another comrade.

[Nikolayev]: Are the elections to be preceded by public debate of the candidates in the party committees and the mass media? The organization of this is not part of the task entrusted to the commission. But consideration of its results and generalization of the proposals and comments submitted by local organizations, primary party organizations, members of the party and citizens is prescribed by law. How will this work be done?

[Ivanova]: The practical work to organize the meetings and hold the debates will be done by the appropriate party committees. We are not concentrating on opinions about candidates, or on the comments and proposals; all this will be considered and examined by the expanded central committee plenum to elect the candidates.

We are asking all organizations, members of the party and citizens, and the mass media to send us information on the results of public debate, and opinions concerning candidates, and ideas on the upcoming work of the CPSU candidates elected.

I would like to say a special word about the instructions issued to candidates from the CPSU. The law does not establish any standard concerning instructions to particular candidates from a public organization. In particular, the general instructions to deputies from the CPSU are contained in the appeal "To the Party and the Soviet People." At the same time, during the course of meetings with candidates from the party, particular assignments and instructions are being and will be expressed. Of course, they will be taken into consideration and, if they are of a socially significant nature, after discussion they will be fulfilled by deputies.

[Nikolayev]: Under the law the organization and holding of the elections and presentation of their results have been entrusted to the commission. How will the commission carry out this work?

[Ivanova]: Strictly in accordance with the law, which also stipulates the conditions necessary for insuring secret ballot, procedure for expressing the will, vote-counting rules, and principles to be used in evaluating the correctness of ballot papers. All these democratic principles and standards for organizing the elections will be undeviatingly observed. In my opinion, it will become an important factor in the democratization of internal party life.

**Smolensk Obkom Plenum Discussed, First Secretary Re-Elected**

18000409a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 14 Jan 89 p 2

[Article by V. Tsybul'skiy (Smolensk): "Politically... But How?"]

[Text] The report and election conference of Smolensk party organization was in progress and during its course certain problems typical of the current stage of restructuring were expressed. It was gradually becoming clear that the transitional period for the oblast party organization was a time to get away from the old, customary, administrative-command methods, but so far they are still only looking for approaches to the new—political—methods.

If the secretary of the party committee of the Smolensk construction materials combine, A. Maksimov, could get up in front of the conference and say that a question of brick and cement is a political question, and the delegates could listen and understand him, this could mean only one thing: in the area of brick and cement, i.e. housing, things were bad. Politics begin where the interests of the people disappear.

Judging from the report of the first secretary of the Smolensk party obkom, A. Vlasenko, as well as the statements of the delegates, in the oblast today an unprecedented number of questions fall into the category of political: housing, food products, clothing, roads, and so forth and so on. In such a situation anyone who went up to the podium could with complete justification speak about what he is engaged in, what he knows best—potatoes, technical equipment, humus, cheese making machines, children's tights—without fear of the reproach that he is not discussing what is essential in a political forum. In the oblast today all these questions are political because there is a shortage of all of them. But the conference could and should have demanded of these speakers that they search for ways of solving these political problems politically, i.e. point out the position and methods of the party organizations in this work.

But here is the impression one received—it seemed that one was at a meeting of specialists. But among the specialists there were apparently none specializing in problems that one might expect to be discussed during the period of reports and elections to the party—specialists in problems of party work. For the customary reproaches against the obkom bureau and secretaries

that they are not paying enough attention to a particular problem, that they frequently visit one place and not another, can hardly be considered to be profound or to reveal the reasons for the weak party influence on the life of the oblast. And so rarely could one hear from this podium anything general, analytical, suggesting the reasons for failures and ways of overcoming them in the party organizations of the oblast. Although attempts were made.

The secretary of the party committee of the Smolensk knitwear factory, L. Romanova, did not complain either about business disorder, or about associates, or about the indifference of the obkom to the needs of the factory. She simply related the "conditions" the local authorities were creating at the factory for the construction of housing and the political consequences these engender: they allot sections of land at the other end of the city which have excellent private homes built on them, thus forcing the factory to tear them down. Thus the waiting list for housing increases instead of decreases. And the party committee can neither manage to have the general plan made public nor convince the leadership that these plans adopted in the office in spite of common sense and without discussion can lead to nothing but harm.

Confusion pervaded the speech of the chairman of the oblast committee for television and radio, A. Novikov. There had long been an agricultural crisis in the oblast. Smolensk residents could remember programs that promised a great deal in terms of rectifying the situation and had failed infamously. Another has just been adopted: "Restoration of the Smolensk rural area." The mass media will have to convince people that it is feasible and help gather them together to work on it. But how can this be done when neither the obkom nor the Soviet leadership in the oblast sees the mass media for what they mainly are—a political weapon. Otherwise how does one explain the fact that not a single one of the critical speeches was discussed either in the bureau or in the secretariat? And this also tells of the level of political leadership.

Creative unions, the intelligentsia, and public formations are almost never used to solve the crucial problems of the day. Gifted people get the feeling that their labor is unnecessary, they become involved in their petty arguments within the shops, and they remain indifferent and inert. And what could be worse or more useless for restructuring?

As though in response to this question was the speech by the official secretary of the oblast division of the writers' union, V. Smirnov, which caused a hum of disapproval in the hall. Having declared that the people support the writer so that he can tell the truth, Comrade Smirnov, even with a certain rapture ("I have been fighting for 20 years, 20 years, to get to this podium!") began to "open the people's eyes" to the obkom and its attitude toward culture. He spoke without evidence and made groundless accusations, he made no constructive suggestions to the



communists, and, naturally, he was neither understood nor accepted. The communists were disturbed by this speech and even suggested including in the resolution their disagreement and judgment of Comrade Smirnov and concealing his speech from the public.

But, alas, a different evaluation could be perceived. Such an idea of openness as the possibility of "cutting out the truth" without being concerned about arguments or ways of rectifying the situation arise in places where there is no daily and continual practice of discussing and analyzing problems in public, where the public does not feel equal to the leadership, where courage is careless and hysterical because freedom and dignity are not perceived as inherent in the human condition. Unfortunately, at the conference there were so few examples of understanding of the meaning of constructive and analytical criticism that it became clear that this was not the norm for the life of the oblast party organization.

Returning to the report, you understand that it cannot be faulted on logic, or consistency, or an understanding of today's tasks for the party and ways of implementing them. The large section on the need to master political methods of work was followed by a discussion of a radical restructuring of ideological work and moved on to a detailed analysis of economic management and development of the social sphere. But it was this last section of the report, which is equal in volume to the other two, that convincingly demonstrated all the transitoriness of ideas about how political work should be carried on today by the bureau and its secretariat.

Whatever its faults may have been, the party obkom could by no means have been accused of ignorance of economic problems or ways of resolving them. The most precise recommendations were made regarding this: "Workers of the agroindustrial complex must understand: if they do not provide for the application of 12-15 tons of organic fertilizer per hectare....", "The sovkhozes and kolkhozes must...double the gross yields of potatoes...." With economic imperatives like this it is as though the obkom were warning the party and rayon committee secretaries—democratization and political methods are fine, but we are dealing in concrete figures.

Discussions of political leadership methods paled against the background of concrete figures. And this was well understood by delegates to the conference who were responsible namely for concrete results. Therefore they used the tribune in the traditional way—to "beat into the heads" of the obkom as much as possible about the problems and questions at which "the bureau does not look." Because political methods—there will be time for them, but they are asking about the figures, and they want them soon. In his speech at the conference a member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, V. Nikonov, defined the situation like this: the delegates evaluated fairly critically the "coefficient of return" from political work with people.

On the day of the opening of the oblast party conference the newspaper RABOCHIY PUT announced that 70 years ago in the Smolensk area there were only 2,995 communists while today there are 83,000 of them, and not without feeling it asked: "So are we really not equal to the large tasks set for us by the 27th Party Congress?" The question would seem to be rhetorical. But the course of the conference cause one to think: is it only the number of members that determines the power of the political organization? Is it not the quality of the rank and file, the goals that have been set, and ideas about how these goals are to be reached? Unfortunately, no attempts have been made to look more closely at the oblast party organization from this point of view.

It was announced in the report that each year about 2,000 communists are brought before the party because of drunkenness, moral disintegration, crimes, and other acts. The same report mentioned only individual cases of party penalties for communists because of inability or the failure of the party policy in the economic, ideological, or cultural sphere. Does it turn out that if you are a sober and exemplary citizen and you do not take what does not belong to you you are a thoroughly good communist? But yet the major and decisive criterion for your party work should be how you implement its decisions. It is precisely the return to these criteria for evaluating communists and party organizations that can most surely strengthen the authority of the party and help to master political methods of leadership and find keys to solving the most difficult, vitally important problems that face the party today.

Of course a return to mainly political methods of evaluating party members and party organizations requires guarantees against total reliance on administrative methods which is especially dangerous in this sphere. These guarantees lie in democratization of the party. This was also discussed in the accountability report at the Smolensk party conference.

The next step in this direction would be natural: a detailed and painstaking analysis of how these methods are applied in politically important areas of party work, above all in the social sphere, what results they produce, and if they do not produce results, why. But these expectations have been far from fully justified.

The conference confirmed that the party organization could take charge of the political restructuring in the oblast only by using political work methods. And the work ended here. Now the new members of the obkom will have to determine in practice how, concretely, this is to be done.

\*\*\*\*\*

An organizational plenum of the new CPSU obkom took place. A. Blasenkov was elected first secretary of the Smolensk obkom.



**Irkutsk Obkom Plenum Objectively Assessed,  
First Secretary Re-Elected**  
18000410a Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA  
in Russian 12 Jan 89 p 2

[Report by special correspondents V. Ivashkovskiy and V. Fomin: "A Difficult Comprehension. A Dialogue by Our Special Correspondents Following the Irkutsk Oblast Party Conference"]

[Text] This was the second speaker interrupted from the hall by impatient applause. He had to set aside his prepared text and make it up as he went along...

**Fact:** this has long been no sensational occurrence. But its assessment unexpectedly caused a divergence between the authors of these notes. One of us saw this as eloquent proof of the democratic changes taking place in the life of the party organizations in the oblast. The other regarded it as an attempt at self-evaluation for a relapse into the stagnation of the past, from which many communists are still not free. And so, failing to reach a common opinion, we agreed as follows: in the future each of us will look at what is happening from his own viewpoint and then we shall exchange impressions. As a result, our account of the Irkutsk Oblast Party Conference has taken the form of a conversation between an optimist and a pessimist.

**Optimist:** This is the fifth party conference that I remember. Against the backdrop of earlier conferences, this one is distinguished by its feeling of democracy, absence of rigid organization and its critical mood. It is impossible not to notice these obvious signs of change in the style and methods of party leadership in development of the oblast. Like the particular fact that when we entered the party obkom we were not met by the vigilant gaze of a militiaman... The party apparatus has become much more accessible not only for communists but also for nonparty people.

**Pessimist:** Well, who is denying that there have been changes? There are undoubtedly changes, but they have been made not only by the desire of a particular party organ but by the need to comply with the provisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th Party Conference. If we really intend to change the style and methods of party work in a radical way then it would also be necessary to seek out new forms in which to express them. And the question is, how does the present accountability report differ from previous reports?

**Optimist:** Primarily in the realistic nature of the assessments of the present state of affairs in the oblast and their meaningful nature and social orientation. And here I am in total solidarity with T. Sigitova, A. Myasnikov and other delegates speaking in the discussion.

**Pessimist:** I am too. But the attempt to cram into the report the entire mass of problems with which the obkom is dealing is unacceptable. And since the emphasis on many directions of work is growing stronger, the reports

acquire a persistent tendency to swell in volume. This time the speaker, the first secretary of the party obkom V. Potapov asked for 1 hour and 40 minutes. And we both saw how inattentive delegates had become after only half an hour. And for the last 30 minutes the hall was virtually incapable of assimilating the information.

**Optimist:** But some fast patter from the rostrum of such a crucial forum is out of place. How can this be?

**Pessimist:** If I were a delegate I would prefer to spend 3 days reading the full report so as to mark it up with a pencil and check my thoughts with my comrades in the primary party organization. To the point, the party obkom has taken a step in that direction by publishing the theses of the report in its own press organ. Perhaps it can also be done in other ways. Perhaps the obkom as a whole rather than the first secretary could present the report. Why not have all obkom secretaries speak at the conference and deliver accountability reports on the lines of work that they oversee? Competently, briefly, in their own way. This alone would facilitate the assimilation of information. The more so since the report is the product of the collective labor of many members of the obkom. And in general I have long been seeking a precedent in which the report of a party or soviet leading organ started with the question: have people started to live better during this past accountability period?

**Optimist:** But the speaker did provide answers to those questions. Let me quote directly: "Over the past 3 years more than R1 billion of capital investments have been made in the agro-industrial complex in the oblast. We have succeeded in somewhat improving efficiency in agriculture and increasing output... The steps taken have made it possible to achieve a noticeable strengthening of the housing construction base and increase the rate of housing construction. Over the past 3 years 600,000 square meters of above-plan housing have been brought into use, and 50,000 families have received well-appointed apartments... Since the beginning of the five-year plan production of consumer goods has risen 21 percent, and above-plan goods worth R270 million have been produced..." The real advances are beyond dispute.

**Pessimist:** I would rather draw attention to the figures that stand in the report after words like "however" and "at the same time"... They do not inspire optimism. This year orders from trade for foodstuffs have been fulfilled only 63 percent. Capital investment growth in the countryside is outstripping the output/capital ratio by a factor of 2.5. Over the past 7 years the rural population has declined by 40,000 and 108 populated points have ceased to exist... Some 230,000 families are in need of better housing conditions; 33,000 of them are living in dilapidated and emergency housing, while another 10,000 are living in hostels... And this year there has been a shortfall of R100 million in satisfying demand for consumer goods... This is not the time to play the fanfares but to beat the alarm. But there was no special sense of alarm in either the report or the statements.

Again we had the kind of managers who mounted the party dais holding out their hands to the obkom: give us this, help us with that. We talk and talk about delineation of functions between party, soviet and economic organs... Ah, no!

**Optimist:** It is as if each one of us sees what he wants to see. Of the 25 people taking part in the discussion, the creatively thinking people can be singled out in the same way. It was precisely they who held the delegates' attention on the urgent problems of the present period: enhancing the personal authority of party leaders and the party in general, the struggle for the purity of its ranks and its augmentation with the most worthy people, the switch in ideological influence by moving from some abstract audience to the specific person, the priorities in business, putting deeds before words. It is these criteria that have led the oblast party organization during the accountability period, as it strives to achieve a situation in which each of its members lives with the cares and concerns of the people. It has decisively rid itself of those who have failed to satisfy these high requirements. Those who spoke named many specific names. And the generalized figures were made public in the same report: "During the course of public and political certification more than 1,000 communists incurred penalties. Over the past 3 years about 4,000 have been expelled from the party and 1,200 candidates were refused admission to the party." Candidness and a sense of criticism on the part of delegates were in general in the spirit of the present conference. Recall, for example, the essence of the statement by Ye. Rusanova, the party secretary from construction-and-assembly team No 571: up to now no noticeable changes have taken place in the style and methods of apparatus of the party obkom itself and they are foreseen only in the future, and reports by members of the obkom between conferences are a purely pro forma affair, while the apparatchiks travel out to the localities with stereotype reference reports that are suitable for virtually any case and for any rayon.

**Pessimist:** Most of the criticism is of a nominal nature. There is a lack of specificity in it with regard to particular targets. The ecological problems of the Baykal are already in the full view of the world public, but at the conference there was hardly a mention of it, obviously because of the fear of inflaming new passions.

**Optimist:** There has been criticism enough of late. The oblast has been disturbed by the activity of the unofficial environmental protection associations and there has been serious polemic in many of the labor collectives and this has splashed out onto the pages of the press, from the large-circulation newspapers to the central newspapers. And I draw your attention to the fact that the position of the oblast organizations, first and foremost the party obkom, is meeting with increasing understanding and support among the population. It was precisely the obkom that assumed strict control over compliance with the party and government decree on protecting the

"sacred sea," and at its initiative that an all-union social-ecological expert examination of the situation in the Baykal region was convened...

**Pessimist:** ... And the result has been that of the 55 measures envisaged by the decree, during the period 1987-1988 little more than half were fully implemented... So that the problem is little "seen and raised" and ways must still be found to solve it. And when those ways have been determined, we must move toward them purposefully and doggedly, without references to objective difficulties. And it is the same in everything. Otherwise, at their next party conference the communists of Irkutsk will have to state that provision of treatment facilities for the population of the oblast is a factor of 1.5 to 2 below the normativ, and that children go to school not just in two but even three shifts. Incidentally, was it not at the last forum of communists in the Priangarya area that it was announced for all to hear that by the time of the 24th, that is, the next, this present party conference, there would be a new building for the musical theater? Well, there is no theater and I heard nothing from the dais about this, or the names of those to blame for the failure to make good this election promise.

**Optimist:** While reminding us about the shortcomings we shall nevertheless find positive things. In my opinion, the present formulation of the oblast party organ has taken place in an extremely democratic and public manner. All candidates for the party organ were nominated with the direct involvement of the communists in the primary party organizations. VOSTOCHNO-SIBIRSKAYA PRAVDA published a complete list of candidates for discussion. After this, another several dozen proposals and criticisms from communists in the oblast were received by the party obkom commission entrusted with reviewing the candidates. Giving due consideration to their opinions, the names of the director of the "Sharatskiy" sovkhos, Yu. Khoylov, and the chief of the "Irkutskvodmelioratsiya" Association, B. Timergaleyev, were withdrawn from the list proposed earlier. And in general half of the previous composition of the party obkom was renewed.

**Pessimist:** Yes, this is an example of retreat from the earlier secrecy and "behind-closed-doors" mentality in the party apparatus. It can only be welcomed. But I must again ask the question. What happened with the nomination of candidates for the leading organ when two of them had to be snatched from the footboard of a departing train? A group of members of the party committee at the Irkutsk Polytechnical Institute has also expressed dissatisfaction with the composition of the new obkom and wrote an open letter to delegates in the oblast newspaper on the day that the conference opened. I would like to quote parts of it: "There is doubt from the standpoint of the democratization of party life that 58.5 percent of the proposed makeup are staff workers from the party and soviet apparatus and top managers from enterprises and organizations, while rank-and-file communists make up only 34.8 percent... So it is that the



present makeup of the obkom has been renewed predominantly by the names while the duties have remained inviolable. And the reaction of the delegates to the letter was unique: the personal criticism of the oblast newspaper editor G. Butakov was clearly accentuated. The newspaper, they said, is besmirching leading cadres and undermining the authority of party leaders of all rank and the party in general. This attitude on the part of the conference delegates does not seem to me to be fortuitous. For in the secret ballot for the party obkom G. Butakov received 107 votes "against," somewhat more than for all of the other candidates together.

**Optimist:** We admit the justice of the remarks made by the authors of the open letter. But here we have a paradox: the communists at the polytechnical institute nominated as obkom member—whom do you think?—the rector of the institute, S. Leonov. Another top person! The nominations in other primary party organizations were probably the same. The old habit of setting one's hopes in the "boss" and nominating directors, managers and apparatchiks "for the top" dies hard. What does this show? It shows not the authority of the leader but rather that in some places the levers of democracy are still being moved by the same bureaucrats. So that there really is food for thought here...

None of those speaking during the debate touched on the accountability report of the auditing commission and that report was confirmed only in a pro forma manner. At the same time some provisions of the report were, let us say, of a poor quality, and the untimely way in which letters and statements were investigated probably requires that delegates pay more attention to this.

The Irkutsk Oblast party conference took place in a businesslike manner, as it has become customary to say. In addition to the plenary meeting there were interesting speeches in the three sections, where there was discussion of the draft resolution and where more than 100 amendments to it were adopted.

It was on this note that the optimist proposed to end this dialogue. But the positions that we alternately took reflected not only our personal attitude toward the conference but also the opinions of the various groups of delegates and the various attitudes of the communists from the primary party organizations. And evidently the culmination of the conversation is that all those taking part in the forum are unanimous; today the assessment must be made by each communist regardless of the post that he occupies and that determines his business.

At the organizational plenum of the CPSU Irkutsk Obkom V. Potapov was elected first secretary.

### **Kostroma Oblast Party Conference Re-Elects First Secretary**

18000352 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
12 Dec 88 p 2

[Article by M. Ovcharov: "The Reserves of Trust" under the "Notes from a Party Conference" heading]

[Text] The following incident occurred at the start of the meeting. The first secretary of the Kostroma party gorkom was called to the podium, but turned out to be absent. The audience stirred. Then, a collective farm leaseholder took to the podium. The gorkom secretary spoke second (it transpired later that he had a legitimate reason to be late).

This was how an established pattern that had endured for many years crumbled before our very eyes. Indeed, why must the first secretary always speak first? In any case, the delegates did not care in what order the speakers appeared but in what a particular speaker had to say—and not just from the podium. The auditorium was equipped with free-access microphones which the audience used quite frequently. It seemed that people were in a hurry to speak out, concerned that there simply would not be enough time for everyone to speak from the podium. In fact, they were probably right. It was revealed later that 53 delegates requested to speak, or one out of every ten.

What was the topic of that animated discussion by the delegates to the 21st oblast party conference? Which issues were most important to them? Several serious and complex problems were identified in the CPSU obkom report presented by first secretary of the oblast party committee V. Toropov and in delegates' speeches. A quarter of oblast enterprises have been posting either low profits or losses. Harvests have been poor. Half of all kolchozes and sovkhoses get yields of less than 2,000 kilograms of milk per head of cattle. A quarter of the cattle do not reproduce. The construction of housing, schools, hospitals and stores often falls short of plan.

But no matter what topic was raised at the conference—be it supply problems, the environmental crisis or ideological mistakes—the discussion invariably turned to how publicly, democratically and openly a given important issue is being approached and to what extent the principles of social justice and needs and opinions of the people are being taken into account in the process.

I jotted down in my notebook the following three sentences from the report: "As we revamp the work of soviets, we must steadily introduce democratic principles into their activities... Ignoring this requirement may at times lead to conflict situations and popular discontent. An example of this is the authoritarian decision by the Kostroma city ispolkom to change the specialization of a number of retail store and to alter bus routes."



The entire city has been incensed by the latter situation. A viaduct has recently been closed in the city and as a result the public transportation system has been in a state of chaos. People can not get where they need to go; some do not know how to get to their destination in the first place. Naturally, complaints flooded the agency. The problem is that the public had not been consulted when the public transportation route system had been redesigned.

A similar situation arose when the specialization of a number of stores was altered. For instance, the city soviet ispolkom, without asking the people, simply turned food store No.33 in the Lagernaya Street district over to the "Kostromskoy" agricultural complex. That decision, made behind closed doors, immediately excited the anger of the district's inhabitants. They called a large meeting and went as far as to suggest that deputy chairman of the city ispolkom S.Orlov be recalled; yet, apparently, this popular outcry did not upset the deputy chairman too much as he runs in a different district.

These are two separate examples. Yet, in both of them public opinion was disregarded and the voters' needs were not taken into account. Of course, it is great that today such incidents do not go unreported. Delegates spoke about them. But the legitimate question arises why we had to wait for the oblast party conference. "I do not understand why the buro of the city party committee did not consider this complex situation before," said driver of the Kostroma passenger transportation enterprise No.1 V.Maksimov.

Why indeed? And why do such situations arise at all? Is it not because the authoritarian bureaucratic management style survives in the party and soviet apparatus and among economic managers? Many delegates expressed their grave concern that this is true.

The following are quotes from speeches delivered from the podium and audience remarks: "Why does the obkom select or assign party personnel in absolute secrecy?" (V.Osokin, first secretary of the Mezhevskiy rayon party raykom); "At times, leasing organizations on the countryside are formed in a manner resembling forced collectivization. Leasing is wonderful but we must first clear the economic fog in the farmers' heads." (V.Popov, mechanic at the "Chernopenskiy" sovkhoz); "At first, someone called us from the superior party organization and 'suggested' whom we should elect as our conference delegate. We were outraged" (S.Rumyantsev, artist); "Last year, our rayon sold 400 tons of milk and 120 tons of meat to the state. Yet, there was hardly any improvement in our own stores... There is a lot of talk about self-supply, but nothing has been done." (V.Kosbkin, first secretary of the Krasnoselskiy rayon party raykom); "Bureaucratic authoritarian methods have not been eradicated. Many issues are decided without consulting the people. We dismissed the director of our construction and installation administration for incompetence, but found out later that he was

made deputy director at a factory." (V.Dzhankovich, party committee secretary at the "Motordetal" plant); "Do you know what goes on in rail transport? Remember Arzamas and Sverdlovsk [last year's publicized freight train explosions]? Some say this can't happen here... I am asking members of the party obkom to visit the tracks personally and to see what is going on there. (V.Pichkalov, engineer at the Buyskiy locomotive depot).

Many appeals to party workers to visit here or to go there were heard at the conference. One can understand their authors. But I wonder whether these demands to visit and go are compatible with the party's role as a political vanguard. Do we not unwittingly long for the return of interference by party organs into the work of local authorities and labor collectives and for the resumption of petty controls?

"It seems that the party obkom and local management entities function at opposite poles," said at the conference I.Kireychev, chairman of the Makaryevskiy rayon ispolkom. "Let us look at what happens when obkom members visit a rayon. They ask why there are deficiencies in milk yields and tell us what needs to be done and how, whereas our business is to apologize and explain." This is nothing but an echo of an old ill which was even more bluntly described by oblast ispolkom chairman A.Yeremin in his speech: "Many people speak today of the need to increase the role of soviets, but in practice some raykom and gorkom secretaries continue to ignore soviets and their ispolkoms and infringe on their rights, which creates uncertainty in their work and causes decline of initiative and at times demoralization."

True, the obkom report noted that the separation of functions between party and soviet bodies is a complex task. To be frank, few soviets are ready for the heavy burden that is being passed on to them. At the same time, it is sometimes difficult to identify purely political or purely economic issues. Still, it is intolerable when party leaders mistake the separation of functions for freedom from political responsibility for satisfying the vital needs of the people. Last fall, for instance, there was an avalanche of complaints in the town of Sharye about the poor supply of vegetables. What was the outcome? The rayon and city ispolkoms were irresponsibly passive, apparently recalling the good old days, whereas the party gorkom maintained a strange hands-off attitude.

It is extremely important for party and soviet entities to develop a management style under the conditions of separation of functions that would achieve maximum efficiency in the economy, the social sphere and politics. And as far as politics are concerned, they invariably entail care for the people and for their demands and needs.

So, the Kostroma oblast party conference is over. Its delegates passed a resolution, a set of instructions of sorts to the new obkom listing more or less everything that needs to be done now. But something must be done. As one delegate astutely put it, the people's reserves of credit are not limitless.

The first plenum of the Kostroma oblast CPSU committee, which was devoted to organizational matters, elected V. Toropov first secretary of the obkom.

**Tyumen Delegates Vote Against First Secretary**  
*18000346a Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA*  
*in Russian 23 Dec 88 p 2*

[Article by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA special correspondents I. Ognev and Ye. Khozhlov: "Openly and Secretly: Notes From the Tyumen Oblast Party Conference"]

[Text] It was an unexpected outcome when the results of the election to the new makeup of the party's oblast committee were announced. Out of the 785 delegates, 139 had voted against the candidacy of the obkom's First Secretary G. Bogomyakov. The result contradicted the course of the conference itself. No one had expressed any serious comments concerning Gennadiy Pavlovich's actions. The obkom's work had been recognized as being satisfactory—there had been only one "against" and seven abstentions. And even that small disagreement was perceived, in accordance with the present times, positively, and once again emphasized the democratic nature of the discussion. There were various opinions. Statements were made at a fever pitch. Finally, there was an unprecedented situation: the struggle for promotion as a member of the obkom, which ended in the removal of one of the most important oblast managers. But despite all of this, many of the delegates preferred to express their true attitude toward the work of the obkom and the first secretary in booing for secret voting.

We shall attempt to analyze why the "open" and the "secret" evaluations did not coincide.

Well, how, in general, does one evaluate the work of a party organization consisting of 160,000 persons? By its production results. First of all. Especially since the party organization has behind it Tyumen Oblast, which provides our country's economy with gas, petroleum, and currency. The figures in the report indicate that there has been obvious progress here. Every day, almost 1.1 million tons of petroleum are pumped out of the earth in Tyumen Oblast, and the debt to the government is being steadily reduced; and 1.5 million cubic meters of natural gas is produced, which is a quantity that exceeds the assignments. Are we really to believe that the oblast party committee did not apply sufficient efforts to guarantee this very strenuous rate?

Let us take another work direction. During a 3-year period, the housing fund was increased by 28 percent. The level of consumption increased, in terms of a single inhabitant, from 70 to 76 kilograms for meat products; from 383 to 418 for dairy products; etc.

Putting it more succinctly, and using the words of one of the delegates, there was dynamism in the economy and there had been a broad scope in the achievements. However, all this did not guard against the aggravation of the old problems or the appearance of new ones.

The housing problem. Conference delegate M. Tarabarov, from the Nenets settlement of Nyda, for example, sees it this way:

"All the structures have become run-down. There is no way that the sovkhoz, by its own efforts, can resolve this problem. In one year we are building only eight apartments. Do you have any idea what that means? Not even the great-grandsons of the shepherds and fishers will receive housing. People do not believe me as the party committee secretary. Consequently, they do not believe the party's obkom either."

(In parentheses we might say that the crux of the matter is not the monetary means. The home-building base is undeveloped. Structures for social, cultural, and everyday purposes that were activated during a three-year period had a value of a billion rubles less than the amount planned. Housing areas are growing without schools, settlements without hospitals, and cities without movie theaters.)

The food problem. Here is an excerpt from a statement made by A. Gutsul (city of Raduzhnyy), leader of a brigade of finishers at a construction-and-installation trust):

"It is gratifying to hear that the food problem is being resolved for many of our neighbors. That cannot be said about Raduzhnyy. For example, I work all day. But, in addition, I am a mother and a homemaker. I have to feed my family. But in the evening, when I go into the store, I see empty shelves."

(We might add that the population in the oblast has been increasing more rapidly than the production of the basic food products. And the prices of vegetables and fruit in the state stores are exactly twice as high as they are for people in the neighboring Sverdlovsk Oblast.)

The ecological problem. The national problem. The youth problem. The problem of the "informals"... Each of them was mentioned with alarm. People have a fresh memory of the stormy rallies against the building of the chemical plant, and the skirmishes between youth groups. During the very hours when the conference delegates were discussing whether Communists should be banned from participating in the informal organizations or, conversely, they should use this method to

defend their leadership among the masses, an organizing meeting of the Popular Front was in progress in Tyumen. It is also a complicated matter to give evaluations because the impressive growth indicators do not reflect the completeness or the diversity of the real processes in the economy and in social life.

When a speaker at the conference discussed the stagnant phenomena which, in the early 1980's, affected the state of affairs in the oblast, he correlated them to the slump in petroleum production. But if we are to be exact, this was the result of the stagnation, and the primary cause lay in the strategic shortsightedness that had been demonstrated a decade earlier. We can recall that period inasmuch as, at that time, the slogan "Petroleum at any price!" was gaining momentum. The price keeps growing, and it is becoming ruinous. Today the expenditures per ton of crude oil from the new deposits have exceeded the intelligent limits. From the deposits that were discovered this year, it is possible put only one-fifth into production; the others are unprofitable. The gigantic oil funnel draws in more and more metal, cement, and other resources, although they ought to be channeled into the social sphere. What will happen in the future? We do not expect a second Samotlor. We can hope to retain the present rate only in one instance—if we assume that one-fourth of the petroleum by the year 1995 will be produced from deposits that have not yet been discovered.

The practice of the party's obkom, judging from the report, has not undergone any changes. It has retained both the old tactics and the previous peremptory style.

"I have had a comparatively short work longevity in my new assignment," V. Sidorchev, First Secretary of the Nizhnevartovsk CPSU Gorkom, says. "But during all that time not a single branch department of the party's obkom raised even once the questions of any political methods of leadership. There was just one question asked—how many kilograms, how many tons, how many rubles had been 'made,' fulfilled, etc."

An attempt was made at the conference to depart from the customary scheme with a branch breakdown, and to evaluate precisely the obkom's political work. To what extent had it succeeded? Delegate Ye. Bezrukov, First Secretary of the CPSU Tsentralnyy Rayon Committee, Tyumen, gave the following evaluation:

"It is difficult to call the ideological section a report. The form of expression—without dealing in specifics—is more similar to a seminar exercise. The authors apparently had definite difficulty in preparing the section that is linked with the economy. The feeling was that at any instance one would hear a phrase to the effect that such and such a well at such and such a sector had produced so much more petroleum. There are more than enough specifics here, but the activity of the party committees was shown poorly. And that is not accidental, comrades.

Today we speak a lot about political methods. But what are they? Who has attempted to delineate the forms and methods of political leadership?"

It seems to us that one could discern at the conference two ideas concerning them, two kinds of logic. The first is the traditional one, which can be summarized as the party support of economic and social progress. The other one was expressed in the statement made by delegate R. Nigmatulin, corresponding member of USSR Academy of Sciences. In essence, he indicated that many of today's misfortunes evolve from the inability to foresee situations. This can be seen most clearly in the attitude toward science. It is difficult to find in the country a branch that has been touched by scientific-technical progress as weakly as the petroleum industry. But let's make a comparison: today, with the same funds that are annually allocated in Tyumen Oblast for fundamental research, it is possible to drill a total of... three wells. "This is a pernicious, kopeck saving that will have an effect of your children and mine," the scientist said.

It was not until after more than 20 years that the first academy institute appeared in Tyumen, and the interminable negotiations are still under way concerning the creation of a branch of SO [Siberian Department] of USSR Academy of Sciences. Meanwhile the branch NII [scientific-research institutes] are so weak that they cannot yet formalize up-to-date technical assignments for the machine builders. This forces the branch to attract to the oil fields additional thousands of people who, once again, cannot be provided with housing or with food products.

Before the conference began, we attempted to ascertain the delegates' opinion concerning the obkom's actions. We received just one answer: we'll listen to the report, and then we'll make our evaluation. Well, the report is over, but the delegates still say that they do not have a sufficient idea. They compare the oblast conference with the life of their okrug committees, raykoms, and primary organizations, and conclude that: things today are more uneasy in the outlying areas, there is more criticism, more openness, and the participation rate is higher. In addition it was ascertained that one-third of the elected makeup of the obkom during the entire reporting period had not, even once, made a statement at plenums or submitted any comments or recommendations. Is that accidental?

One can find an explanation for everything. The poor level of information among the party aktiv, like the inactivity of a considerable number of its people, is no hindrance for the obkom apparatus. It is much more convenient to issue commands, to hammer out percentages, without essentially changing anything. Of course, it is necessary to make definite internal modifications, to create—to use the formulation employed in the report—"democratic methods." But one can constantly see the old apparatus-style practice shining through them. Certainly no one was convinced, for example, by the statement that the obkom was not rushing, as it had done



previously, "to remove from reporting to their organizations" the party committee secretaries, because, actually, everything is just the reverse. In Tyumen itself, all the city and rayon party managers have been replaced. But how? First secretaries of the gorkom and the Tsentralnyy Rayon Committee V. Kholyavko and P. Anisimov were re-elected a month before the conferences.

While the future makeup of the obkom was being discussed, certain delegates engaged in computations. It turned out that it included more than a third of the commission that had carried out a preliminary selection of the candidacies. So it turned out that they had nominated themselves. One was rejected. Then the presiding officer, failing to note the hands that had been thrown up, firmly added to the list a "suitable" candidate.

"What a play! We didn't even have time to wink an eye," V. Muradov, brigade leader at the pipe-building trust, commented later concerning this episode.

It is no easy matter to oppose these "methods," especially if there has not been any actual democratic experience—that is something that all of us have a serious lack of. It is just as difficult for most of the delegates to evaluate the future prospects. According to the information that was given in the report, it was impossible to judge the future progress of the restructuring of party work in Tyumen Oblast, or to judge the degree of decisiveness in the obkom's mood or whether it would act in conformity with the spirit of the 19th All-Union Party Conference. "It is recommended that many cadre questions be transferred to the soviet, economic, and local party agencies," "the reorganization of the apparatus with the purpose of greater orientation on the political functions of the leaders is being completed"—that is all that is stated. But there are also two figures: eight obkom departments have been abolished, and 30 percent of the apparatus has been cut. How does one discuss the overall phrases?

Therefore it is possible that many people who had not been able to formulate their position or to express it from the rostrum, announced it by means of "black balls."

#### **Okrug Election Commission Head Outlines Pre-Election Activities**

18000385 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
25 Dec 88 p 2

[Interview with Yu.E. Vrublevskis, secretary of the Rizhskiy party raykom and chairman of the Kekava election okrug commission, by V. Smetannikov: "The First Days of Work" under the "Election of USSR People's Deputies" rubric; first 3 paragraphs a boldface introduction]

[Text] Okrug election committees have begun their work. The present election campaign is radically different from all previous ones. In the conditions of democratization of

the Soviet society, a comprehensive goal has been set: to assert in practice the role of the working man as the true master at the workplace and in government.

The legal groundwork for this has been laid by the recent session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which approved changes and amendments to the USSR Constitution to that effect and passed the law on electing USSR people's deputies. In accordance with article 17 of that law, 32 national and territorial election okrugs have been set up in the LaSSR. Among them is the Kekava okrug consisting of roughly one half of Rizhskiy rayon. Yuris Eduardovich Vrublevskis, secretary of the Rizhskiy party raykom, became its chairman.

Our correspondent asked Yu. Vrublevskis several questions about the activity of the commission which he heads.

[Smetannikov] Tell us, please, what kind of people have been chosen for the Kekava okrug commission and on what principle?

[Vrublevskis] Our okrug commission is comprised of 15 members. Their names were published in republican papers and there is no need to list them here. Most candidates were proposed by labor collectives, such as the "Kekava" experimental exemplary paltry farm, Olayskiy plastics recycling plant, "Baldone" kolkhoz, Maruskiy consumer cooperative society, "Balozni" peat-producing plant and others. The main principle was to make sure that the commission's members were not indifferent to public activity, were experienced in working with people, energetic, creative and, most important, held a principled view on perestroika's ideas. I think that without such qualities no one could be chosen under the current election system.

Life will doubtless pose difficult problems to the commission, and the representatives of the people, capable as they are to think in a new way and deeply conscious of their personal responsibility to the residents of the entire okrug, will certainly find direct, constructive ways of solving them.

I have known some members of the commission for many years, from the time when I was deputy chairman of the Rizhskiy rayispolkom. I know, for instance, that one of the most experienced teachers in our rayon, Ayna Kvepa, has a true gift for organization. She was chosen by the labor collective of the Buldurskiy training sovkhov. Deputy chairman of the "Kekava" agricultural firm and kolkhoz Ingmar Niendra has a very good reputation, too. His persistence and principled approach to any task he is entrusted with have long been known to us.

The political activity of the people has increased sharply recently, especially after the 19th all-union party conference. This activity has propelled a growing number of activists to the forefront. One of such ardent individuals

is senior researcher of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences' Institute of Inorganic Chemistry Zigfrid Bruvers. It is not surprising that his co-workers selected him for the okrug election commission.

In short, commission members have all the necessary qualities which I have mentioned. Naturally, this will help them carry out their duties defined by the law on electing USSR people's deputies.

The first meeting of the commission has already taken place. I was entrusted with the position of chairman. I. Niedra was elected deputy chairman and I. Matelsone, department head of the Kekava mobile agricultural machinery garage, its secretary. Our headquarters were established in the building of the Kekava town council. Now, commission members will think through and submit their ideas on how to develop a better, efficient plan for future work. We will approve it at the next meeting, which is set for January 5.

[Smetannikov] You said that the okrug commission may face difficult problems. This means that you foresee certain difficulties. What are they? What is the best way to overcome them?

[Vrublevskis] First, as long experience has shown, the task of election commissions on the countryside is much harder than that of similar commissions in a city. The difficulties are caused by the much greater area that needs to be covered and distances between settlements.

The Kekava election okrug includes, besides its center and many kolkhozes and sovkhoses, the town of Olayne, villages Balozhi, Salaspils, Baldone and others. There are many homesteads, too. Commission members live in different parts of the rayon, and will have to spend a lot of time in Kekava. These so-called geographical difficulties could be overcome with the help of local soviets' ispolkoms. And of course, a large share of the burden will be assumed by uchastok [polling station] election commissions.

The commission must make sure that constitutional norms are upheld and not allow violations of even a smallest part of the letter or the spirit of the election law. To do this, the okrug election commission has been vested with considerable authority.

I want to use this opportunity to remind everyone which of our responsibilities are the most important.

The okrug commission will organize the selection of candidates and their meetings with voters; it will set up pre-election meetings and will register selected candidates. It will also be responsible for supervising uchastok commissions. Finally, we will have to approve the ballot form for the Kekava national territorial okrug, make sure that the ballots are printed and delivered to uchastok commissions, and, if need be, organize a runoff election.

In the conditions whereby the republic's citizen chooses the most worthy, in his opinion, candidate from a list of several, the possibility of a runoff election always exists. In the past, the election process was in effect nothing more than approval for a single candidate. Now, the number of names on the ballot is unlimited. Could it happen that the okrug selects not just 2 or 3 candidates, but many more? Then, the possibility of a runoff poll increases. To avoid this, we need to consolidate our forces and opinions. To achieve such consolidation we need the participation of party organizations at all levels and of individual communists.

Our country has entered the first stage of political reform. All innovations inevitably cause certain difficulties, but the collective mind of every election commission—be it central, okrug or uchastok one—will find ways to overcome them quickly and painlessly.

I would like to stress that now all of us who are involved in the election campaign must conduct great explanatory work among the population. Every voter must clearly understand the full range of his rights defined by the new election law.

[Smetannikov] In your capacity as commission chairman, you surely have already had to explain some paragraphs and articles of that law...

[Vrublevskis] Yes, and in my capacity as raykom secretary, as well. Here is one example. According to article 18 of the election law, which defines the norms of representation for public organizations, the USSR Communist Party will be represented at the congress of the USSR people's deputies by 100 deputies. Now, we often hear that the CPSU has already begun selecting its candidates. Why? According to the law, the selection process should start no earlier than 3 months before the elections. Apparently, certain comrades did not read attentively enough the communique of the election commission for electing USSR people's deputies of the USSR Communist Party, which states:

"To ensure democratic principles in the elections, the election commission requests party organizations, members and candidate members of the CPSU to propose their candidates for deputies. Candidacies put forward by local communists should be reviewed by primary party organizations and then, with the participation of representatives from those organizations, by party gorkoms and raykoms... As candidacies are consolidated, the preference will be given to those who have got broad support both in party organizations and among communists."

Pardon me for this lengthy quotation, where I purposefully stressed the word propose. It is clear from this quotation that no violation of the law has occurred. Currently, at their meetings communists put forward the names of those comrades who are most worthy in their opinion. These, I repeat, are only proposals of possible

candidates, but not selection. This practice, which is quite new for us, is natural: the party wants its candidates to be truly active participants of perestroika, truly respected by their peers and possessing all the qualities needed to work efficiently in the highest organ of state power in the nation.

[Smetannikov] Thank you for the interview.

**Donetsk Oblast Conference Highlights  
Reorganization, Economy**  
*18000314a Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA  
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 22 Dec 88 p 2*

[Article by G. Dorofeyev: "Keeping Up With Demands"]

[Text] The Donetsk Regional Party Committee has seen dramatic change: the number of departments has been halved; the staff has been reduced by 43 people; and the Committee has fewer Secretaries now. Commissions in charge of Party work, personnel, ideology, social and economic development, and one dealing with agriculture have been established. Following the abolition of the branch departments, the Committee staffers have changed the style and methods of their work, facing more daunting problems.

The bureaus and the Secretariat now discuss almost half as many issues at their sessions, said A. Vinnik, First Secretary of the Party Obkom. Fewer documents are sent down the chain of command, and the number of meetings and sessions, which used to tie up a large number of experts, has been reduced significantly. The restructuring of the Party apparatus has made it possible to promote economic reform more vigorously. Positive results have been achieved: virtually all economic branches have increased output since the beginning of the current five-year period; the construction of housing, social and cultural amenities is proceeding apace.

The steps taken by the Obkom to improve the style and the methods of work of the city and district party committees have not generated the expected changes. Quite a few of the party committees are set in the old mold, displaying no initiative. The Zhdanov, Shakty, Konstantinov, Torez and some other city and district party committees came under strong fire during the conference. The speakers pointed to the lack of efforts to enforce work discipline and to the serious mistakes made in ideological activities, approach to social issues, and environmental protection.

These issues were raised by many delegates, including V. Sertsov, a mineworkers' team leader from the Chervona Zirka coal mine, run by the Torezant ratsit production association; Ye. Yukhno, First Secretary of the Gorlov City Party Committee; O. Panosovskiy, manager of the Uglegorsk thermal power station; A. Morkovkin, Secretary of the Party Committee at the Kalinin coal mine. Although many delegates took the floor, they focused on

economic problems most of the time, stressing that the Party Committee and the Obkom itself should step up their efforts to consolidate the new structure and the new approaches to Party work. Unfortunately, even many delegates stuck to the old guns and yardsticks.

Many delegates spoke about the force of habit slowing down improvements, as seen in personnel management. Around 400 Party functionaries have been issued strong Party reprimands and relieved of their jobs for either having failed to keep up with them or for having compromised themselves. The Obkom Party and organization department, headed for many years by E. Krygin, has made serious mistakes in the selection of Party personnel, as has the bureau itself. These departments have not jettisoned the old pattern of administration, under which the heads of the Party committees were appointed from above, without taking into consideration the opinion of the rank-and-file Communists.

These mistakes can be avoided in the future if glasnost and democracy are broadened, and the Party Committee secretaries and plant managers are selected through competition, the delegates said. This does not mean that Party committees would have to ignore personnel management. Such attitudes, which are quite common, pose a serious threat. The city and district Party Committees should pay more, not less, attention to personnel management in order to prevent the election of dishonest people, with the support of loud mouths and demagogues, to the top management positions. Ardent advocates of perestroika should be elected to head collectives.

The conference highlighted the controversial relationship between Party committees and the soviets. It is only too easy to lose control over economic management in a situation when the branch departments have been abolished following structural changes, and the Executive committees have not become strong enough. To give a few examples, many managers have not reorganized the operation of their units along the new lines, in the belief that the economic accountability will automatically take care of all the problems. The Party committees have been on the sidelines too. According to some surveys, only one third of the people have been working at full throttle following the economic changes. Many working hours have been lost due to absenteeism, tardiness and other violations. As many as two and a half thousand industrial workers do not show up daily, resulting in a R55 million shortfall of output a year.

The trouble is that ever more mistakes are committed. The coal mines are scheduled to switch over to economic accountability as of January 1, but the terms and conditions have not been laid down yet. The Donbas miners find themselves in a critical situation. Eight percent of the mines have not been overhauled for over 20 years; the operation of the underground transport and the ventilation of the cleaning and preparatory shafts have run into enormous difficulties; the miners lack equipment to work low-yield seams and to do preparatory



excavations. SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIIYA spotlighted these problems in a series of articles under the common title "Mineworkers' Life".

The delegates agreed that although A. Shchadov, the USSR Minister of Coal Mining, acknowledged this criticism as justified, he failed to offer solutions. "The coal mining industry faces many serious and urgent problems that put the future of the country's first coal mining basin in jeopardy," said V. Ignatov, first secretary of the Donetsk City Party Committee. "The miners have repeatedly brought them to the attention of the Obkom and sought the Minister's help. He has made lavish promises, but he fails to deliver. The Oblast Party Committee is fence-sitting as well."

The delegates sent notes to the presidium, demanding an answer from A. Fisun, First Deputy Minister. They expected Aleksander Petrovich, who comes from Donbas himself and is very familiar with coalminers' needs, to offer sweeping proposals. But the latter offered nothing but platitudes.

Striking a highly optimistic tune, V. Kucherenko, chairman of the oblispolkom, assured the delegates that each family would receive a separate apartment by the year 2000. This promise did not match his concern over the lengthening waiting list for housing, which includes 260,000 people now. At the same time, a number of cities and the Oblast in general fail to utilize the financial means allocated every year for the construction of housing, social and cultural amenities. The current annual program is in jeopardy as well.

The delegates voiced much concern over food and water supplies, environmental protection and poor services. They demanded that the newly elected Party Obkom members exercise more control over these areas.

A. Vinnik was elected First Secretary of the Party Obkom Committee during the organizational plenary session.

#### **Estonian SSR December Supsov Session Speeches**

##### **Ryuytel on USSR Supsov Decisions**

18000364a Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA  
in Russian 10 Dec 88 p 1

[Article, under rubric "9th Session of ESSR Supreme Soviet 11th Convocation": "Extraordinary 12th Session of USSR Supreme Soviet and the 26 November 1988 Session of the Presidium of USSR Supreme Soviet: Report by A. Ryutel, Chairman of the Presidium of ESSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The materials of the recently ended extraordinary session of USSR Supreme Soviet and the session of the Presidium of USSR Supreme Soviet that preceded it

have already been illuminated sufficiently broadly by the mass information media. Therefore, please allow me today to dwell only on individual factors and aspects.

I would emphasize as the first matter the tremendous significance of what has occurred in the political life of our union state for its advancement toward the completeness of the authority of the soviets and toward the building of a socialist rule-of-law state. The measures that were discussed for carrying out the political reform will lead to very substantial changes in the life of the USSR, the importance of which, obviously, will be interpreted decades later. Any questions of changing or adding to the Basic Law of the USSR are also important from the point of view of Estonia's aspirations and development.

In my statements at the session of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and also at the extraordinary session of USSR Supreme Soviet that followed it, I attempted to concentrate my attention on the problems that are on the agenda today in our republic. Without a doubt, both for us and for the other republics, at the present time, under conditions of *perestroyka* and in the course of the discussion of the draft of the USSR Law Concerning Changes and Additions to the Basic Law of the USSR, there have arisen problems, thoughts, and ideas that previously no one even thought of. That was mentioned at the session by many deputies. At the same time it was felt that, when criticizing us and making reproachful statements about us, they did not notice that, really, these problems that we have are of the same order. The course aimed at renovation has not been proceeding identically in all the union republics, but there is nothing unnatural about this. Mainly, however, our concepts and ideas coincide—we must reorganize our society in conformity with the Leninist conception of authority and on the level of today's requirements.

The work of the deputies at the session that was mentioned was, indisputably, difficult, or one might even say superdifficult. In the course of the nationwide discussion of the drafts of the USSR laws, we received a large number of recommendations that could be enacted only on the nationwide level. By the time that the laws were passed, their drafts proved to be much better than they had been previously. They took into consideration a number of recommendations that had come from Estonia, including those that had been enacted at the extraordinary session of our Supreme Soviet, but a number of recommendations that did not fit within the confines of the laws will have to be taken into consideration by the legislators in their subsequent work.

What, then, were the chief results of the recommendations made by the republic?

In paragraph 2 of Part 3 of Article 108 of the draft of the Law, it had been stated that exclusive jurisdiction of the

Congress of USSR People's Deputies includes the making of decisions with regard to questions of the composition of the USSR, and the confirmation of the formation of new autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts as part of union republics.

This principle received universal nonacceptance, inasmuch as that text could be understood in such a way that the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, for example, can convert a union republic into an autonomous republic and resolve other questions of the composition of the USSR.

A substantial change was made in the text of the Law, and that Law now reads as follows: "The exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies includes the making of decisions with regard to questions of national-state structure which have been included within the jurisdiction of the USSR."

In paragraph 12 of Part 3 of Article 108 of the draft of the Law, it had been stipulated that the exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies includes the repealing of legislative acts that were passed by USSR Supreme Soviet and the highest agencies of state authority of the union and autonomous republics if they do not conform to the USSR Constitution.

The enactment of this principle would mean the limitation or even the violation of the sovereign rights of the union republic, inasmuch as, in conformity with it, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies could also repeal, by circumventing the Supreme Soviet of the union republic, the legislative acts of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the union republic.

In the text of the Law, that principle has been changed, and now reads as follows: "The exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies includes the repealing of acts passed by USSR Supreme Soviet."

In Part 4 of Article 111 of the draft of the Law, it had been stipulated that every union republic elects seven deputies to the Council of Nationalities, but in conformity with the Law the number of deputies to be elected from the union republic has been increased to 11.

In paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Article 113 of the draft of the Law, it had been stated that USSR Supreme Soviet carries out the legislative regulation of relations of ownership, administration of the national economy and social-cultural construction, the budgetary-financial system, the payment of labor and price determination, taxation, the protection of the environment and the use of natural resources, the procedure for the implementation of the constitutional rights, freedoms, and duties of the citizens, and other relations.

The establishment of this principle would be a substantial hindrance in implementing the idea of republic-level cost accountability.

In the text of the Law this principle has been concretized in such a way that the regulation of the previously mentioned questions is carried out within the limits of the competency of the USSR.

In Part 3 of Article 116 of the draft of the Law, it had been stipulated that the questions that are to be considered primarily in the Council of Nationalities are questions of the social and economic development of the republics, the autonomous oblasts, and the autonomous okrugs, and questions of national culture and interethnic education.

The enactment of this principle would substantially limit the sovereign rights of the union republic. In the text of the Law, the discussion of the previously mentioned questions has been excluded from the competency of the Council of Nationalities.

In Paragraph 13 of Part 1 of Article 119 of the draft of the Law, it had been stipulated that the Presidium of USSR Supreme Soviet, in the interests of defending the USSR, can declare a state of war or state of emergency either in individual localities or throughout the country, establishing special forms of administration if necessary.

This principle would directly violate the sovereign rights of the union republic and would contradict the principles of development of democracy and the building of a rule-of-law state.

In the text of the Law (paragraph 4, Part 1, Article 119), this principle has been changed and now reads as follows: "The Presidium of USSR Supreme Soviet, in the interests of defending the USSR and the security of its citizens, announces a state of war or state of emergency in individual localities with the mandatory consideration of that question together with the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the appropriate union republic; [and] can introduce, in the situations indicated, special forms of the administration to be carried out by state agencies of the USSR and the union republics"

In conformity with Part 1 of Article 125 of the draft of the law, when electing the USSR Committee for Constitutional Oversight, no requirement was established with the representation of the union republics in that Committee.

According to the text of the Law, the number of Committee members has been increased from 13 to 21, and it has been stipulated that now it will include representatives from each union republic.

Certain of our recommendations concerning the introduction of changes into the draft of the USSR Law entitled "Election of USSR People's Deputies" were partially taken into consideration. Articles 9, 37, and 43 of the draft of the Law had additions made to them, and it is now stated there that "the right to nominate candidates for election as USSR people's deputies from public

organizations (belongs to) their unionwide agencies that take into consideration the recommendations with regard to the candidates for election as deputies that have come in from the local agencies, the low-level collectives, and the members of those organizations."

The requirement to form electoral districts at large-scale railroad and motor bus stations, at airports and at sea and river ports, and in hotels has been removed from Article 19, "Formation of Electoral Districts," and Article 20, "Procedure and Norm for Formation of Electoral Districts." Similar principles have been removed from other articles also.

Thus, we can state firmly that several of our recommendations were implemented, and that was quite an accomplishment.

Comrades!

Speaking at the November Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade M. S. Gorbachev said that, in the course of *perestroika*, it is necessary to change over to practical deeds, including to complete cost accountability at the enterprise and regional level. The nation of Estonia completely supports this idea and has been carrying out successful work to develop it. All this was mentioned at our session today. I would like to re-emphasize that it is precisely in the concept of regional cost accountability that we see one of the real opportunities for bringing the USSR economy out of its state of stagnation. But the resolution of questions of economics and social life, in turn, is a prerequisite for the consolidation of the nations. We assume—and I expressed this idea in Moscow—that in a strong union state every component part of it—every union republic—must also be strong. Unfortunately, the union departments in most instances operate in a way that is guided only by the interests of fulfilling the plan as such. Because of this narrow view of things, the natural environment of our republic and the development of our social sphere have suffered seriously. Inasmuch as the development of local initiative was not encouraged, the old management methods restrained the integrated, complete development of the region's national economy. The deputies from other union republics also mentioned in their statements their opposition to departmental omnipotence.

All this, once again, attests to the fact that the improvement of legislation has not been keeping in step with the times. Many legislative acts are a hindrance on the path of developing productive forces and social development. The legislative acts which until now were created in the quiet of the office represented the *ex post facto* establishment of the state of affairs. At the same time we understand that the development of laws must outstrip the processes of social development, must reflect those processes, and must create the opportunities for them. Otherwise the legal mechanism will operate ineffectively.

The decisions that were made at the last session and that were unanimously supported by the deputies to our republic's Supreme Soviet on 16 November reflected the desire of the nation of Estonia to expand the rights of the union republics and the autonomous subdivisions, and to make the relations between the USSR and the union republics more harmonious. That was re-emphasized in the resolution of the November Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee concerning measures to carry out the political reform of state construction.

Our session's decisions received various legal interpretation in statements made by deputies at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and provided the opportunity to reflect the processes occurring in our society without taking into consideration our political situation or the peculiarities of the current period.

For us a factor of primary importance is the political content of these decisions, which context corresponds to the party's course, aimed at the renovation of society, and it is one of the points of departure for the subsequent stages of the reform of the political system of Soviet society.

It often happened that, both in our own press and in the central press, these problems were not always illuminated adequately. We had discussions on this topic with a number of editors, and so we hope that, with the passage of time, this position will change.

My dear deputies!

The 26 November 1988 Ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet concerning the nonconformity to the USSR Constitution and to USSR laws of the ESSR Law entitled "The Introduction of Changes and Additions to the Constitution (Basic Law) of Estonian SSR" and the declaration entitled "Sovereignty of Estonian SSR," which were passed at the 16 November extraordinary session of our Supreme Soviet, was published in the press and all of you are already familiar with it. That Ukase recognized as being invalid four articles of the corrections to our Constitution and two parts of the declaration of sovereignty.

At the same time, taking onto consideration the seriousness of the steps that we had taken and the reasons for them, at a session of the Presidium of USSR Supreme Soviet paragraph 2 was included in that Ukase. That paragraph recognizes as being substantiated the need to develop at the following stage of the political reform, on the basis of constitutional norms, a system of measures and state-legal mechanisms to guarantee the protection of the political and socioeconomic interests of the union republics, and the expansion and protection of their sovereign rights.

It is completely understandable that the Ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet does not reveal in detail the content of the planned measures or legal



mechanisms. It states only that the considerations that will be kept in mind first of all are the opportunities provided for the Council of Nationalities of USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Committee for Constitutional Oversight that is being formed. From the 26 November Ukase it follows that the next stage of the political reform will be planned and that will be done with the direct participation of the union republics. Incidentally, USSR Supreme Soviet at its most recent session, already passed a decree governing further measures in the political reform of state construction, and this provides the legal basis for carrying out the second important stage of the political reform. Our task, thus, is to join actively in the work of submitting constructive recommendations and in the development of the drafts for the other component parts of the Constitution. In precisely that way we will be able to implement our idea of the USSR as being a unique federation of free states, and our ideas concerning the relations between the central authority and the union republics, as well as the nature and forms of the ties among the union republics.

These principles were taken into consideration: paragraph 3 of the draft of the decree required the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet, and the local soviets of people's deputies to be guided by these principles when carrying out the reform of the political system.

In view of what has been stated, we feel that it would be completely substantiated and timely to form at the present session of ESSR Supreme Soviet a commission (or at least to elect its leaders), that would begin to work on the questions of developing a new ESSR Basic Law and the questions of improving constitutional legislation. Obviously, the constitutional commission to be created will regularly inform the republic's deputies and public about the results of its work.

What should I say in conclusion? The Estonian nation has a number of sore spots that require the making of decisions urgently. The constitutional path of resolving these questions was mentioned at the 11th plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia, which laid the foundation also for the process of consolidating all the forces. The very difficult period of Stalin era and of stagnation has left in the awareness of our people such a deep impression that even when a course had been taken toward *perestroika* they were not immediately able to become aware of or to see the main line—the joint actions of everyone in the name of the future. The excessive actions that occurred in our mass movements bring to a fever pitch the extremism of individuals and people's passions, and create an incorrect picture about the situation in our republic. We must act soberly and calmly to overcome this. We are convinced that the process of consolidation will pick up momentum, and that the efficient, constructive dialogue that is being conducted in our republic's domestic policy, the attempt to understand one another, and reciprocal respect and

support will provide the opportunity to achieve a noticeable acceleration in the development of Estonia and will furnish a reliable hearth at home and prosperity for all its citizens, for every family.

**Pyldroos on Status of Estonian Language**  
18000364 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA  
in Russian 9 Dec 88 p 3

[Article, under rubric "9th Session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation: "The Status of the State Language in ESSR: Report by Deputy E. Pyldroos, chairman of the Working Group on the Status of the Estonian Language"]

[Text] I truthfully do not know whether it will be necessary for me to repeat once again the reasons why we are faced with the need to develop a Law Governing Language. It is a question of existence, of survival, of the preservation of the Estonian nation in the centuries to come. It is a question of warning people about whether we will have the same fate as dozens of other nations and national groups that are losing or that have already lost their language. And what kind of a nation is there without a language?

It is a question of language. The Law Governing Language has taken on symbolic importance in the consciousness of the Estonian nation. It means "no" to the previous policy of assimilation. It means the overcoming of many fears and extremist actions, and confidence and faith in tomorrow.

Language lives only if it functions on all levels—not only as an everyday language, even if only in the language of folk songs, but also as an official, scientific, living, modern, cultural language.

In a number of areas of life, the Estonian language has recently begun to recede. It is sometimes possible to get along entirely without the Estonian language in medical institutions, in interrelationships with workers in the militia, the railroads, trade, and personal services. The purpose of the Law Governing Language lies, then, in returning to the Estonian language its comprehensive use. This is the only thing that will guarantee the preservation and the further development of the language as a single whole.

In the report at the 11th plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia [ECP] it is stated: "The position of the Bureau of the ECP Central Committee with regard to the question of the status of the Estonian language is also completely unambiguous. The Russian language is the language of interethnic communication among the peoples of the USSR, and every citizen must—I repeat, must—be able at any point in the Soviet Union to conduct his affairs in that language. But the Estonian language must be the state language in Estonian SSR, and people in Estonia must be able to

conducted all their affairs in the Estonian language. Naturally, the positions of the Estonian language are established at the state level." It is from this premise that we proceeded.

We proceeded from two principles, two levels, which we attempted to link to one another. At the state, social level, it was necessary to devote special attention to the Estonian language and culture and to guarantee their protection. Estonia must become a protected zone for the Estonian language and Estonian culture. But at the level of the individual citizen, the private individual, it is necessary to provide every inhabitant of Estonia, irrespective of his native language or nationality, all the democratic rights and the opportunity to participate actively in the life of society.

"The status of the Estonian language as the state language does not infringe on the civil rights of those individuals whose native language is some other language. While protecting the Estonian language at the state level, Estonian SSR recognizes the right of citizens of any nationality to develop their native language and culture, and recognizes the equality of all citizens in the face of the law, irrespective of what language is their native one," the preamble of the new version of the draft of the Law Governing Language states.

In the course of the nationwide discussion, the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet received 10,492 letters bearing 317,517 signatures. On them, only approximately 5 percent placed a negative evaluation on the Law Governing Language as a whole.

This is very interesting material. The recommendations that were especially valuable were the ones that contained specific recommendations, as well as ideas that were expressed in the course of numerous meetings. Basing one's actions on all of this, it was possible to rework completely the original text of the draft of the Law Governing Language. Large or small changes were introduced into approximately two-thirds of the articles. Certain articles were removed, but at the same time a number of new ones were added to the draft. The preamble was presented in new form.

We did not retreat one step from those guarantees that the Law Governing Language has been called upon to give to the Estonian language. But at the same time in the new version we attempted in a clearer, more easily understood, and, probably, more consistent manner to proceed also with respect to the Russian language from those principles that were reflected in the previously quoted excerpt from the preamble.

Approximately 40 percent of the inhabitants of our republic converse in Russian. We do not set as our goal the assimilation of this part of the population, or the turning of them into Estonians. Everyone must remain the same person that he is, he must speak his native

language, but he must, at the same time, respect and understand his neighbor and his language. This also is one of the basic principles of the draft of the Law Governing Language.

The rules allow me to dwell only on individual questions that have been considered in the draft—the most important ones that have caused most of the disputes, that have been subjected to considerable change as compared with the previous version.

The Law stipulates that a person can conduct business in any institution, enterprise, or organization in any corner of Estonia by using the Estonian language and can obtain an answer and documents in Estonian. It also guarantees the capability of conducting business, receiving a reply, and of formalizing documents in the Russian language. All this is treated as a human right; and an obligation on the part of the institutions—irrespective of the language in which that institution operates.

Obviously, it is also necessary to devote attention to what this draft does not say.

The law, as a rule, does not regulate the language that a worker must use on the job when speaking to a coworker. By way of an exception, a manager is required to speak in the language used by his subordinate. I consider this to be an extremely important democratic principle.

The term used in the draft "the language of business correspondence" means in essence the language of documentation. In principle, the draft stipulates the changeover to business correspondence in Estonian. But at the same time the opportunity to use the Russian language is retained, if there is reason for doing so.

It must be admitted that the concreteness with which the first version attempted to regulate the language of business correspondence was too rigid and caused a large number of objections.

Recommendations were also made to assure that the question of the language of business correspondence was resolved in the labor collectives themselves. At first glance, the principle would seem to be correct and democratic. However, the working group decided that for at least the initial period it would be incorrect to reject a definite amount of monitoring on the part of the center. We did not, however, in any way set as our goal the annoying of the Russian-speaking collectives. The fact of the matter is that recently the collectives in which the majority of workers are Estonians have been increasingly changing over to Russian as the language of business correspondence. The return to the Estonian language in business correspondence would require even of them definite additional efforts and would cause complications. I am not convinced that they would voluntarily undertake these efforts in each individual instance. Herein lies another problem which, on the basis of its significance, is not limited to the interests of the nation or the national culture

as a whole. In the new version it has been decided to include in the competency of the Presidium of ESSR Supreme Soviet the organizing of the appropriate oversight body and the development of the appropriate instruction manuals. In this delicate question this would provide the opportunity for a more flexible approach to the determination of the time frame, beginning as soon as possible and ending as far in the future as possible, and also to taking into consideration the specifics of the various regions. It is completely obvious that similar problems, for example, on Kihyumaa and in Narva require a completely different approach.

However, it was deemed necessary to translate into Estonian on a systems basis all the official intrarepublic correspondence and reports. But here too definite exceptions are stipulated.

At meetings in labor collectives, a question that was raised repeatedly was the question of technical documentation. For example, my attention was drawn to this at a meeting in Narva. It had been deemed necessary for the limitations imposed on the language of business dealings not to extend to technical documentation, inasmuch the translation of the technical documentation coming from other places is practically impossible. This was taken into consideration in the corrected version.

The draft takes into consideration the right of all national groups to obtain general education. Probably the most heated passions in the course of the discussion were evoked by the questions linked with vocational, secondary special, and higher education. In developing the first version, we set for ourselves the task of guaranteeing that a person who use the Estonian language in studying all the specialties that are taught in Estonia. At the present time that possibility does not exist. There are specialties that are taught only in Russian. However, the too complicated and too confused formulation of this article in the draft provided the cause for many people to read into it the meaning that, in the future, instruction would be given only in Estonian. That required us to refine the formulation of the article and to supplement it by a section that deals with the opportunities for obtaining an education in the Russian language, in which, in order to continue the obtaining of an education in our republic, two basic alternatives are provided for.

These questions will be resolved more precisely within the confines of the republic's conception of public education.

Personally, I feel that the question can be radically resolved only when, in addition to what has already been stated, young people of any nationality will be guaranteed a return to their native republic after completing their education in other republics. At present there is no such guarantee. The Law Governing Language, however, is incapable of regulating this question.

In the name of the working group, I recommend that the republic leadership find a resolution.

The draft does not make any requirements whatsoever on the overwhelming majority of the population with respect to their knowledge and use of language. However, one of the central requirements that is made by the draft is that specific groups of people must be fluent in Estonian and Russian—managerial workers, workers in institutions of state authority and state administration, public organizations, the legal system, agencies to protect the public order and to carry out inspections, medical personnel, journalists, workers in the personal-services, trade, and communication sphere, life-saving services, and everyone else whose job requires them to deal with people. This requirement will go into effect in four years. It has evoked sharp objections.

Adherents of the International Movement assert that this is a matter of unconstitutional national discrimination, that this will serve to create an obstacle on the path to advancement up the promotion ladder for workers of Russian nationality. At such time even the word "genocide" has been used. Nevertheless, I would like to remind you that the requirement of the knowledge of both languages—both Estonian and Russian—with respect to the previously mentioned officials is made of workers of all nationalities, irrespective of whether they are Estonians, Russians, or representatives of other nationalities. No special requirements are made of anyone. Everyone is equal before the law. Everyone must be fluent in both languages. We might recall that any job assignment presupposes that the person has specific vocational skills. If a person does not have them, the path to that job assignment is closed, but this should not be considered with respect to him a violation of the principle of equal rights or constitutional guarantees.

Under the conditions of the complex national structure of our republic, the knowledge of languages by the previously mentioned officials is one of the necessary vocational skills without which it is impossible to bring nations closer together, or to develop our society as a single, integrated, and smoothly operating mechanism.

Fluency in languages means a level of education that has been achieved. But if the requirements on the level of education are declared to be a violation of constitutional freedoms, then things will be seriously wrong. I personally am convinced that the time is not too far away when, at least with respect to our managerial workers, there will also be a requirement that they know foreign languages.

It is, of course, easy to make a demand on a person's linguistic educational level. It is much more complicated to guarantee it. Over the period of many decades in the first phase of state policy—and, I emphasize, conscious policy—there was the conversion of the Russian language into the second native language of persons of other nationalities. Then the second phase inevitably followed—the dying away of the national



language, its functioning only as an ethnographic language. We know quite a few nations to whom this fate has befallen. Fortunately, we were only at the very beginning of that path. We had assimilated the Russian language rather well. This definitely is an excellent thing—people must know languages. But at the same time the teaching of Estonian to the representatives of other nationalities who are residing in Estonia used to be viewed as a hobby that did not have any practical importance. And now we see the result—our people are not fluent in the language. There are not enough teachers and there are not enough textbooks, not to mention classrooms or the necessary technical aids. But what is worst is that the person's natural, psychological need to study language has been destroyed.

This draft can only set goals. But it can also lay a firm foundation for subsequent steps.

The republic's Council of Ministers has been assigned the task of guaranteeing the legally dictated curricula for language study. This is a complicated, expensive, and by no means easy task. But if we are in favor of the consolidation of society, we have no other way.

Obviously, for people whose job assignment presupposes the knowledge of language, the teaching of language must be organized at state or departmental expense. The task is facilitated by the fact that, with respect to many specialties in vocational work, it is possible to limit oneself to a rather small vocabulary, the mastery of which should not constitute any large amount of labor.

A problem that remains a separate one is the substantial improvement of the instruction of Estonian in general educational schools. In this regard, the law limits the setting of goals, and the more concrete programs of actions must find reflection in the conception of the public education of ESSR.

A struggle has broken out around the Law Governing Language.

An atmosphere of nervousness has engendered, with respect to the Law Governing Language, in many Russian-speaking persons living in Estonia a fear and sense of being unprotected.

In each linguistic nuance people try to find an ulterior motive. We can know that we never had any such ulterior motive. We can know that there are no reasons for distrust or fears, but we must also know that, in order to prove this, we will need to have time, we will have to give people the opportunity to calm down, especially since we ourselves sometimes acted in a childishly unthought-out manner, without taking other people's psychology into consideration. But we also must not forget that this fear was sometimes deliberately and skillfully incited. There are public circles—true, they are small ones—that have been putting up a real and organized resistance to the Law Governing Language, in

which circles it is not thought to be possible to make any compromises, in which the people's moods are fundamentally opposed to any language that even mentions in passing or that sets the goal of defending the Estonian language and culture. The attempt is made to convince us that this is an interethnic conflict. No, it is something different. It is a conflict between yesterday and today.

The ones who spoke out first of all against the Law Governing Language were the local ideologues of the major union-wide monopolies. These are unified systems that presuppose unification everywhere that they are in operation. The ideologues in this systems see in Estonia only a chessboard for playing all this different moves. And naturally they are annoyed if that chessboard suddenly begins to want to show its nonstandard features in some way and acquire its own individuality. What kind of chessboard is this? Well, we really do want to have our own individuality.

We have come up against forces that publicly set as their goal an interethnic confrontation as a means of preserving their previous status. We were convinced of this a week ago in the House of Political Education, and we saw this several days ago on the steps of City Hall. I emphasize that none of this has anything in common with the protection of the interests of people of Russian nationality who are living on Estonian soil.

The Law Governing Language has become one of the key ideological questions in the struggle between monopolism and decentralization in our republic.

Deputies, lying on your desks for your familiarization are the drafts of the Law Governing Language. Now it is your turn to have your say.

#### **Krasnodar Officials Discuss Reform of Party Apparatus**

*18000294 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 88 p 2*

[Interview with I. Polozkov, First Secretary, Krasnodar CPSU Kraykom; N. Gritsenko, First Secretary, Krasnodar CPSU Gorkom, and R. Bagadirov, First Secretary, Teuchezhskiy CPSU Raykom, by correspondent K. Ak-senov in Krasnodar Kray: "Renewal" under the rubric "Perestroyka and Apparatus"; first two paragraphs are a boldface introduction]

[Text] On October 8 PRAVDA published a report on the plenum of the Krasnodar CPSU Kraykom which discussed perhaps the most fundamental issue, that of party committees learning political leadership methods. After that, the newspaper's local bureau received letters from all over the country. Readers wanted to know how the restructuring of party apparatus is carried out in the Kuban region and asked us to write about its early experience and problems.

Having selected the most interesting letters, some of them quite incisive and unusual ones, I asked first secretaries I. Polozkov, of the Krasnodar Kraykom, N. Gritsenko, of the Krasnodar Raykom, and R. Bagadirov, of the Teuchezhskiy Raykom, to reply to them.

[Aksenov] In their letters, V. Sergienko from Lipetsk, S. Grigoryan from Krasnodar and many others ask for a more specific answer to the question how party committees' apparatus is being restructured. Which departments are being eliminated and which new ones set up? What happens to employees who lose their jobs? Moreover, some readers write that they have heard the cuts in the number of managers in some places are purely symbolic.

[Polozkov] To be honest, this process, which is carried out in accordance with the decisions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference and the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, is not as simple as it may have seemed at first. It is natural: at issue here is not a mechanical process of renaming departments and reducing staff. Our task is rather more difficult. While reducing the number of workers we must also build a strong party apparatus capable of mastering political methods of managing perestroika and intensifying primary organizations' work in all areas of the economy, in the consumer and other sectors. The changes in the political system, the separation of powers and the broadening of democracy, have not relieved party committees of responsibility for everything that happens in the kray, city, rayon or labor collective. Rather on the contrary, the role of the party as a political vanguard of the people has grown noticeably. We are reorganizing the apparatus based on these considerations.

Now more specifically about the kraykom. First, departments of industry, construction, transportation and communications, science and educational institutions and retail and consumer services, as well as some other ones, have been abolished. As a result, the industry monitoring principle, with its numerous files and folders full of reports and memoranda and other attributes of the entrenched office management style, is irrevocably on its way out. What has taken its place? Seven departments have been set up at the kraykom, half as many as in the past. The apparatus has been cut by 30 percent, or by 43 workers. These are mainly department heads and their deputies, sector heads and instructors. Only 105 employees remain. Incidentally, whenever we mention this number to party workers or at labor collectives, some people are surprised. "Really, so few?" they ask us. Indeed, it is an organization that has 320,000 communist party members and some 8,000 primary party cells.

Naturally, when the number of positions is cut, it is not easy to form a truly tough party command post capable of making perestroika dynamic and aggressive. Currently we have the following departments: organizational, party and cadre work, ideological, socio-economic, agricultural, state and justice, and general. As can be seen, even their names reveal changes in the scope of their activity.

Of course, we had not been indifferent to this problem before. In recent years, many interesting and instructive methods of cadre work have been developed. Unfortunately, in my opinion no integral, truly modern system tested by theory and in practice exists as yet in this extremely important area. Cadre policy still has too much formalism, red tape and bureaucratic narrow-mindedness in it. As a result, leadership posts are at times assumed by people lacking organizational skills or party modesty. Naturally, we identify such people and relieve them of their responsibilities, but perestroika suffers from such mistakes. They must be avoided.

Other departments too, also in line with the decisions of the 19th party conference, are drastically changing the style and scope of their work.

[Gritsenko] The apparatus of our gorkom is being cut by 15 percent. Three industry departments are being abolished. Only four departments will remain in the new framework: organizational, ideological, socio-economic and general. We now have just 29 employees. For a city with 5 party raykoms and 62,000 communists, it is not too much, you must agree.

What do we regard as the core of apparatus restructuring? We must decisively eliminate the infamous bureaucratic narrow-mindedness and technocratism and stop worshipping the Almighty Number.

I will not deny, I have heard that some think perestroika in the apparatus is nothing more than a reshuffling of staff members and doling out of new positions. Some say that party workers are being quietly moved from industry departments to socio-economic ones. What is the difference anyway, they ask.

The difference is actually enormous. Our current reorganization calls for qualitative changes in party work and for mastering new, political leadership methods. This means active implementation of the party line, with every means of ideological, educational and organizational work, as well as the will of communists, focused on this task. The responsibilities of all positions are changing, from that of instructor all the way to the first secretary of the gorkom. The most important difference is that all, absolutely all questions must now be decided through party organizations.

[Bagadirov] The apparatus of rural raykoms is not being cut, which is also true in the case of gorkoms in cities without a rayon subdivision. To be frank, there is no one to cut here. We have only 15 employees. Structural changes may not seem great either. We have abolished 1 out of our 4 departments, the agricultural one, and changed the general department into clerical. This means that we have set up two departments: organizational and ideological.

In reality, however, we are facing deeper changes. Their essence is not in the numbers or distribution of positions. It is the style of party work that is changing. Of

course, if a former agricultural department worker, for instance, at his new post at the organizational department, goes on sending out inquiries and monitoring farms, perestroika will remain only on paper and will have no impact. The idea is different. All employees must learn political leadership skills and visit party organizations more often. The goal is to help primary organization secretaries to get the work going.

[Aksenov] V.Krutko from Krasnodar and other PRAVDA readers are concerned about party workers whose jobs have been eliminated.

[Polozkov] I will not claim that this is an easy, painless process. No matter how you look at it, even some raykom first secretaries and kraykom department heads had to leave. As a rule, these are experienced and respected workers; they are not guilty of any crime. But now, all of a sudden, they are being cashiered. All this must be taken into account and we are trying to be attentive and sensitive, but some people probably feel insulted anyway. But I want to talk about a different issue.

When the kraykom apparatus was getting ready for reorganization, agricultural department instructors V.Ostapenko and G.Kholod did not wait to be laid off but asked to be sent into the thick of things, as the saying goes. The former went to the imeni Lenin kolkhoz, in Pavlovskiy Rayon, where he had began his career, and the latter to the "Primorskiy" kolkhoz, in Shcherbinovskiy Rayon. Cosacks liked the fact that at this important stage of perestroika the two party workers were not clinging to their prestigious offices and comfortable Krasnodar apartments. They were also inspired by the interesting farm restructuring programs that those comrades proposed to them, and gladly elected them kolkhoz chairmen.

Construction department instructor A.Okudzhava was offered a choice: to stay at the kraykom or to take the position of deputy director of the "Krasnodarstroy" complex—which has long been in an acute crisis, I should add. Aleksandr Viktorovich knew what difficulties awaited him but opted for the heavier burden, asking to be transferred to the construction site. Organizational department instructor A.Ionov applied to the position of agronomist at a laggard suburban sovkhos and got it. He, too, was undaunted by difficulties that doubtless lie ahead.

In a way, the reorganization of the apparatus was a maturity test for our cadre. It is encouraging that most were able to rise above such considerations as personal careers or comfort. Many had to leave cities, abandon their homes, move their families to a new place, seek jobs for their wives and find pre-school facilities and schools for their kids. There are many everyday problems in moving. Yet, communists did not complain.

[Gritsenko] Recently, I have heard the following comment: the gorkom will not abandon its employees and will find a comfortable office for everyone. In reality, we are not forcing our people on anyone. Take, for instance, the case

of B.Zhukov, former deputy chief of the organizational department. He applied to the position of deputy personnel director at the "Krasnodarskiy ZIP" complex. The council of the labor collective selected him. Why? Because Boris Mikhaylovich is known as a professionally mature, sensitive individual. And his ideas, which he shared with the council, sounded attractive.

[Aksenov] Here is another letter. I.Nagorniy from Armavir writes: "Several years ago two party raykoms were formed in our city. At the time, it was hailed as a great accomplishment. Now they are being dismantled. Is it not clear that such reshuffling is harmful?"

[Polozkov] Indeed, at one time there was this passion for splitting cities into rayons and for setting up appropriate party, soviet and other bodies with large managerial staffs. There were other, similar policies as well. For instance, one town would have two overlapping party committees—a town committee and a rural rayon one—two ispolkoms, etc. There was a sort of dual authority, causing many conflicts and family quarrels.

Recently, party organizations have been merged in towns Tikhoretsk, Eysk and Tuapse and in adjoining rural rayons. The advantage of this new structure is obvious. Towns help villagers and vice versa. Here is another example. The situation used to be very poor in Kavkazskiy Rayon, which had great potential for developing agricultural production but not enough resources. The rayon bordered on the industrial town of Kropotkin which suffered from acute shortages of food. A paradoxical situation existed: the bureaucratic barrier kept the two neighbors from coordinating their efforts. Then, in the course of restructuring of the party apparatus, those two party organizations were merged. The gorkom was strengthened by mature personnel.

The author of that letter from Armavir is right: splitting small towns into rayons was not useful. It only increased the managerial apparatus and the flow of papers. It does not accord with the spirit of the times. This is why we had to abolish rayon committees, strengthening the gorkom.

[Aksenov] We get letters and telegrams describing controversies and conflicts arising at reporting and election conferences. It seems that the broadening of democracy and glasnost in the candidate nomination and voting process has brought a breath of fresh air into the restructuring of the party apparatus.

[Polozkov] There have been instances when comrades nominated by superior entities for first and second secretaries of raykoms were not elected. How did we take it? Soberly, without unnecessary emotions and, certainly, without trying to reverse the legitimate collective decisions. Our reasoning is as follows: if a particular leader is rejected by voters, he probably is not regarded as a leader. It is also a reproach to ourselves: clearly, we do not always take a thorough enough measure of the



leadership and moral qualities of those whom we nominate, at times clinging to stereotypes in cadre work. Perestroyka does not tolerate this.

**BSSR CP CC Prepares for CPSU CC Nationalities Plenum**  
*18000382 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 18 Dec 88 p 1*

[Unattributed report entitled: "At the Belorussian Communist Party's Central Committee Buro]

[Text] At its scheduled meeting, the buro of the Central Committee of the BSSR Communist Party approved measures to implement the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee for the preparation to the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee which will consider questions of improving interethnic relations in the USSR.

Party committees and primary party organizations were directed to take active measures to strengthen the multi-ethnic unity of our society and to eliminate issues that have exacerbated the situation, especially in the social sphere and in the development of national cultures and languages. The buro stressed that we must strive to achieve a situation whereby every party committee and party organization truly takes a progressive stand on the question of renewal of socialism, not letting the initiative in the task of raising and solving acute issues slip from their hands, and party workers and all communists diligently carry out the party line.

The buro of the Central Committee of the BSSR Communist Party instructed party committees and organizations to decisively oppose all manifestations of nationalism and attempts to use the broadening of democracy and glasnost to antidemocratic ends.

The ideological department of the Central Committee of the BSSR Communist Party, the BSSR Communist Party Central Committee's Institute of Party History, the Minsk Higher Party School and communists at the head of the BSSR Academy of Sciences, the BSSR Ministry of Public Education and BSSR artistic unions were instructed to assess the practical activity of party and soviet bodies in the republic in solving the nationalities problem in Belorussia during the years of Soviet power and to submit proposals for ideological justifications for the CPSU's nationalities policy and to further strengthen the internationalist and patriotic education of the people.

It was decided to set up a research center at one of the affiliates of the BSSR Academy of Sciences to study important problems of interethnic relations in the republic.

The buro of the Central Committee of the BSSR Communist Party decided that the BSSR Council of Ministers and appropriate departments of the Central Committee of the BSSR Communist Party must undertake an in-depth study of special characteristics of the socioeconomic development of the republic, its oblasts, cities

and rayons, and consider the issue of regional division of labor, of broadening the rights and economic independence of local entities and of increasing their responsibilities and inducements for improving economic performance and environmental situation and utilizing all resources rationally.

They were also asked to study an entire range of problems related to the impending transition of the republic to economic accountability. Particular attention should be paid to ensuring that state and regional interests coexist naturally.

The mass media was directed to ensure a wide coverage and discussion of issues related to the theory and practice of interethnic relations and the experience of solving the nationalities question in our country and abroad, paying special attention to fostering in the republic a climate conducive to strengthening the internationalist unity, friendship and brotherhood of soviet nationalities.

At its meeting, the buro discussed and approved proposals of the Gomel and Mogilev party obkoms and the BSSR Ministry of Culture to build a monument to V.I. Lenin in the town of Loev and the city of Slavgorod.

The buro heard a report by its commission on further study of documents on the repressions of the 1930s and 1940s and the early 1950s on the results of the evaluation of party qualities of a number of individuals who had been fully rehabilitated by the courts, and resolved to reinstate posthumously the following persons to full CPSU membership:

Balitskiy, Anton Vasilyevich, BSSR narkom of education in 1926-29, party member since 1920 (expelled in 1930), unjustly sentenced in 1931 to 10 years imprisonment and in 1937 to death for alleged counterrevolutionary activities and spying;

Dyakov, Ananiy Ivanovich, former BSSR narkom of education (1936-37), party member since 1919 (expelled in 1937), tried together with the so-called "anti-soviet fascist saboteur-terrorist and espionage organization" and sentenced to death in 1937;

Zhukov, Vasily Nikiforovich, former employee of the BSSR state publishing house, party member since 1924 (expelled in 1936), tried on charges of ties with Trotskyites and participation in counterrevolutionary activity and sentenced to 10 years imprisonment in 1936 and later exiled to Krasnoyarsk Kray, where he died in 1951.

The meeting of the buro of the Central Committee of the BSSR Communist Party also discussed several other issues in party work.

**Election Results of BSSR Obkom Plenums  
Reported**

18002456 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA  
in Russian 25 Dec 88 p 1

["At The BSSR CP Obkom Plenums"]

[Text] Plenums of the newly elected party obkoms have  
been held.

In Vitebsk, V.V. Grigoryev was elected first secretary of  
the BSSR CP obkom. Ye.I. Radetskiy was elected second  
secretary. T.I. Misuno, L.A. Naumchuk and V.A. Sako-  
vich were elected secretaries.

In Gomel, A.S. Kamay was elected first secretary. V.A.  
Sanchukovskiy was elected second secretary. S.P. Bobyr,  
A.M. Pevnev and I.N. Smolyar were elected secretaries.

In Minsk, A.A. Malofeyev was elected first secretary of  
the BSSR CP obkom. A.N. Bychek was elected second  
secretary and V.D. Atroshchenko, K.K. Dyagilev and  
K.I. Turovich were elected secretaries.

**Printing Paper Production Problems Persist;  
Shortfalls Predicted**

18300201a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 88 p 2

[Letter from N. Morozov, senior operator of papermaking machine No. 7, member of the Karelian Obkom; and N. Istominskiy, senior operator of papermaking machine No. 9, Karelian ASSR, under the rubric "Warning Signal": "Machines Again Stand Idle"]

[Text] Karelian ASSR—The newspaper PRAVDA for this 7 November carried a warning signal titled "Forced to Stand Idle," which reported that the production of newsprint by its largest producer, the Kondopoga Pulp and Paper Combine, was being disrupted because of a shortage of pulp.

Responding to newspaper articles, the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry took action, and the combine's employees managed with great difficulty, by reducing planned stoppages of high-speed machines, to fulfill November's production program. But the paper manufacturers' hopes that the ministry would not allow any more such disruptions proved unjustified.

In December the work of the branch's pacesetter was even more frenzied than in November. In the first 15 days the Vyborg Pulp and Paper Combine, the Kaliningrad Paper Industry Production Association, and the Bratsk Timber-Industry Combine delivered 490 tons of pulp under plan. As a result, in the three days from 12 to 15 December alone the papermaking machines stood idle for a total of 46 hours. As a result, we produced 20 million square meters less paper. That is as much as it takes to print the republic newspaper LENINSKAYA PRAVDA for a year.

An even more alarming situation with regard to the supplying of the combine is shaping up for 1989. Thus, a state order issued to us for newsprint is unbalanced by planned supplies in the amount of 9,000 tons of pulp and 50,000 cubic meters of wood. Quite naturally, the collective of many thousands of employees has not accepted the state order for fulfillment.

Just a few days remain until the end of the year, and these extremely important questions have not been resolved. With such planning, failures in the work of the enterprise and, with it, tens of publishing houses are inevitable from the very outset of the new year. The combine's employees are waiting for the branch staff to eliminate the imbalance in the state order for 1989 in terms of pulp and wood.

**Researcher Cautions Media Against Thematic  
Overkill, Overemphasis on Readers' Letters**

18300201b Kiev RABOCHAYA GAZETA in Russian  
11 Nov 88 p 3

[Interview with N. V. Kostenko, scientific associate at the Ukraine SSR Academy of Sciences' Philosophy Institute, conducted by A. Tertychnyy: "What Is the Word's Impact?"; date and place of interview not given; first two paragraphs are unattributed source introduction]

[Text] Too often we reduce the answer to the question posed in the headline to "action taken" and readers responses. Yet answers are only the outer layer, the visible part of the iceberg. What is hiding from us there under the water? This question has tormented some journalists for many years. But there are also those among us who live by the simple motto: "Don't teach me how to live! I already know what the reader wants, what he likes and doesn't like in a newspaper."

Do authors and editors really know readers' interests? That was the subject of an interview by a RABOCHAYA GAZETA correspondent with N. V. Kostenko, a scientific associate at the UkSSR Academy of Sciences' Philosophy Institute, who has been studying certain aspects of the mass media's effectiveness.

[Kostenko] Among my newspaper colleagues I frequently encounter a candid or hidden prejudice against concrete sociological studies of newspapers. "We don't need scientists to tell us what to do to make the newspaper popular," they usually say. "Sociologists won't provide us with either qualified personnel or additional salary allocations, won't help us update our equipment, and won't solve our transportation problems or even provide a dependable dictating machine. And just how are we to make the newspaper better under those conditions?"

Let me cite just one result of a comparative analysis: on the one hand—of articles in Komsomol newspapers; on the other—of the topical interests of Kiev young people. According to our data, the subject of career advancement holds fourth place on the scale of attention of potential readers, while in terms of the frequency with which it is mentioned, this subject occupies 15th place on the pages of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and 20th place in the republic press.

The topical gap is even wider when it comes to questions pertaining to the development of human rights and liberties under the conditions of the renewal of our society and improvement of legislation. Among young people this subject occupies second place, while the newspapers assign only 17th place out of 22 places to this subject.



[Tertychnyy] However, I know many reporters and editors who religiously believe that they know the interests of their readership fairly well. Let's take letters. There is no need to say how important they are for a newspaper. But is it justifiable to refer only to this traditional channel of communication?

[Kostenko] Yes, whoever does that errs rather profoundly, albeit sincerely. Back in the 1960s Soviet sociologists, in reference to a number of central publications, noted that the interests of the authors of individual letters by no means reflected the interests of all a newspaper's readers. Not to mention the interests of a potential readership—those people who are not readers but might become readers in accordance with the interests of a given publication.

Moreover, our Belorussian colleagues who studied this matter just recently established additional points that it would not be a bad idea for editorial boards to take into account. They drew the conclusion that orientation toward the active reader (the one who writes the newspaper not with complaints, but with comments and appraisals of articles) prompts editors to satisfy the reader interests of precisely that (relatively small!) reader group. It, in turn, approves that policy, which creates a new impulse on the editors' part to address the "activists." And they by no means represent all reader interests. In such cases, editors move around a closed circle, removing themselves from influencing the masses.

[Tertychnyy] I hope more than one editor will find that information useful. After all, since we were at the university we have known Karl Marx's classic definition: to the same extent that the press is a product of public opinion, it also creates that public opinion. Both functions—reflection and formation—are in direct proportion to one another: to the same extent. In other words: the worse, the more one-sidedly we reflect, the worse we form. I think that is noticeable from the results of sociological "readings," among other things.

[Kostenko] We have not specially studied this problem. But we have established, for example, that the subject of restructuring the work of Komsomol organizations occupies only 15th place out of 17 places defined by our research in the hierarchy of young people's interests. At the same time, about 20 percent of the problem-oriented articles in the republic Komsomol newspapers are devoted to it; i.e., it is indisputably the leading subject.

[Tertychnyy] But the intensive reflection of domestic life is the publisher's direct social commission. Moreover, as we know, the newspaper is not supposed to be under the reader's thumb.

[Kostenko] I am not calling for ignoring the publisher's instructions or the newspaper's purpose. Evidently, the question should be examined on a different plane. For example, quite often, through inertia, newspapers try to compensate for a shortage of quality with additional

quantity. "Numerous articles on the country's domestic life are necessary for a Komsomol newspaper"—that is a widespread stereotype of one-dimensional thinking. Strictly speaking, that is elementary formalism. But what about publishing less and improving the quality? And what about giving the space that is freed to topics in which young people are keenly interested?

[Tertychnyy] Let's suppose that a newspaper has adjusted its structure of subject matter. A person opens the newspaper and sees an article on a subject that interests him and starts to read, and—in two or three minutes his interest runs out. The reader is disappointed—that sort of thing happens rather often. Newspaper people know the basic reasons. But can it be that sociologists have discovered circumstances unknown to journalists?

[Kostenko] We are not counting on finding something unknown to practicing newspaper people. It is no secret that problem-oriented articles, especially controversial and critical articles, arouse the greatest interest. The more often a publication reflects the clash of interests and positions and their wide range, the better it is read. After all, life is the process of overcoming contradictions, always an emotional process, but sometimes an agonizing one as well.

Our research shows that the number of problematical situations in the youth press has noticeably increased.

[Tertychnyy] Allow me a final question. Let us suppose that some editorial board wants to take a look in the sociological "mirror" to find out which of its articles are being read, which are not, and why. What should be done in order to receive a scientific answer to practical questions?

[Kostenko] One must conduct a professional sociological study. The cost-accounting-based research center recently set up under the Ukrainian Division of the Soviet Sociological Association can help. Its Kiev telephone number is 228-41-78.

#### **ZNAMYA Editor's Comments on 1989 Periodical Subscription Controversy**

18300177 Moscow ZNAMYA in Russian No 11,  
Nov 88 pp 236-237

[Article under the rubric of "ZNAMYA's Mail": "From the Editor"]

[Text] Why is it that now, somehow antedating it, we are finally publishing this small article based on many hundreds of readers' letters received by the editors? What is it, a delayed response? No, this is a summing up with some lessons from an event, which should be learned.

We wholly share the conviction of our readers that the limit on subscriptions, introduced without any public discussion, at least, that with the editors of newspapers

and magazines, without scientific studies and justification, and which was introduced by somebody's free will and administratively-bureaucratic methods, was not necessitated by objective reasons.

However, the time and experience obtained at the past 19th Party conference have done their part, namely, this blow did not cause any confusion, as it happened after the publication of the notorious manifesto of the anti-perestroika forces, which is called Nina Andreyeva's letter. Editorial boards of newspapers and magazines, without waiting for orders, immediately began the struggle for glasnost, for the Soviet people's right to objective information on what is happening in the country, and the struggle to implement the resolutions of the Party conference. IZVESTIYA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI expressed their views; OGONEK devoted issue after issue to the campaign; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA repeatedly took part in the discussion and among other articles published the letter from the editor-in-chief of NOVYY MIR S. Zalygin; and the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA published the results of a poll conducted by the All-Union center for public opinion on socioeconomic problems, which is led by the Academician T. Zaslavskaya. In particular, the poll stated the following:

"This year, subscription difficulties affected practically all publications (5 percent were unable to subscribe even to PRAVDA). However, the degree of limitations' severity is extremely uneven. As before, there is a shortage of the popular mass publications, which were limited in the past (49 percent of readers could not subscribe to RABOTNITSA, and these numbers for KREST-YANKA, ZDOROVYE, and ZA RULEM were 40, 33, and 61 percent, respectively. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA was unavailable to 25.5 percent, MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS to 30 percent, and TRUD to 37 percent of interested persons). However, the maximum discontent is caused not by these publications' shortages, but rather by the shortage of relatively small number of magazines and newspapers which have reached the frontline of public interest. The most serious problems of public and socioeconomic life of the country are raised and a historical and social analysis of the society's status is given on their pages, and they provide serious assistance to the Party in its restructuring activities.

Exactly these publications are going to receive the blow from the introduction of limits. The limiting even within the 1988 circulation volumes means a forced suspension of growth of these leading publications' audience, which during the last 2 years has increased from 30 to 400 percent, and this hunger is not satisfied.

...Limits became an obstacle both for the old and new subscribers. 73.1 percent of readers could not subscribe to OGONEK, 61.7 percent to ZNAMYA, 55.2 percent to NOVYY MIR, and 51 percent to DRUZHBA NARODOV. Similar situation exists with certain newspapers

and weeklies: only 48.8 percent of those who wished could subscribe to LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 49 percent to ARGUMENTS AND FACTS, etc.

The situation with MOLODAYA GVARDIYA and NASH SOVREMENNİK is not so critical. The demand for them is many times (5- to 20-fold) smaller than for, let us say, NOVYY MIR, or DRUZHBA NARODOV. In 1988, only 1.5-2 percent of MOLODAYA GVARDIYA's circulation is being sold in Moscow (the same number for NOVYY MIR is 23 percent).

The parade of deputy ministers at the TV program "Discussion on Substance": "What Is Going on With Subscription?": "The One Who Wants Does It, And the One Who Does Not Want, Is Looking for Excuse", was impressive. Without being concerned for personal prestige and not being afraid to "lose the face", the deputy ministers were trying to find in front of each other the reasons, why is it absolutely impossible to do what is necessary to do. And this is the stately thinking? Summing up this sad "Discussion on Substance", the Central TV commentator V.P. Beketov had to say that one comes to a ministry with a clear solution of a problem, and leaves it with a headache...

However, the most happy result was that this time the readers themselves, the people themselves did not allow them to ignore their opinion. The attempt to introduce limits on glasnost caused literally all nation's indignation.

During the prewar years we all were taught the Motherland can do without any of us, but we will not make it without the Motherland. The war began, and we realized that not only we cannot make it without the Motherland, but the Motherland cannot make it without any of us, because there is nobody to defend her except us.

So let us know that perestroika cannot make it without any of us, we must defend perestroika, and we are capable to defend it.

The hard times, the years of stagnation are called by people the "drinking years", and tragedies of the past have taught many to passivity and a sad conviction that neither a single person, nor all of us together can influence anything. Time has come to understand that today we can. You are a citizen and even by yourself alone you are a warrior. And all of us together is a mighty army. We cannot expect a miracle from anywhere, and the abundance will not descend onto us by itself. And when somebody wants us to return us to the silent state of the past, we must remember that we are citizens, and that the present and the future of the country depend on our words and deeds, whether it applies to a peasant's family contract, selection of deputies, air over cities we breathe, purity of lakes and rivers, and protection of land and forests; all this is our common, we are not temporary residents or hired hands on this land, we are masters. We have difficult years ahead due to the heavy legacy we

have inherited, but we will endure and hold out, if we will clearly realize that the historical fate of our Motherland is being determined today, and we ourselves are called upon to determine it.

Time has come to reach manhood. Let us learn the lessons, be tough in difficulties, decisive in struggle, generous in victory, and well-wishing one to another, and not yield to those vicious forces that are trying to split us. Because despite all the differences and the fact

that each of us, both the nation and a single person, are unique in their own way, all of us are the indivisible people of the great, powerful country with a predestined historical future.

The history herself has called upon us, let us be worthy of this call.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda". "ZNAMYA". 1988.



**Creation of Soviet Latvia 1918-1919, Attendant Changes in Republic Discussed**  
*18000441a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian*  
17 Dec 88 pp 1, 4

[Interview with Anatoliy Biron, historian and corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, conducted by A. Grigoryan: "A Successor to the Iskolat Republic"]

[Text] Seventy years ago, on 17 December 1918, the Socialist Soviet Republic of Latvia was proclaimed. By historical standards it existed for only a brief span of time, yet nonetheless it left a profound impression on the history of the formation of the Latvian state system.

So what did happen at the very end of 1918? What separates 18 November, the date of the proclamation of bourgeois Latvia, from the 17 December Manifesto, which proclaimed the establishment of a Latvian Soviet Republic? The answer given to this question by A. Biron, a historian and corresponding member of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences, was the starting point of our conversation.

[Biron] In order to understand this one must first be clear as to which forces could make a realistic claim to power, why they appeared on the historical scene and, finally, what were the strategic objectives they were pursuing.

[Grigoryan] That approach was outlined in our previous conversation, which was published in our newspaper one month ago. In that conversation it was emphasized that at the end of the year in question two forces—the working people and the bourgeoisie—were fighting to establish an independent Latvia. Naturally each of them had a different Latvia in mind and perceived of Latvian independence in accordance with their own class interests.

[Biron] Hence our point of departure has been established. Now let us take a look at the past. We will see above all that the revolutionary movement in Latvia in late 1918 was essentially a continuation of the Great October Revolution. It is highly important and quite essential that we state that. Yet at the same time we should not ignore the fact that this movement was directed against the East Baltic nobility and the local German bourgeoisie, i.e. was along the lines of a national liberation revolution. Research in this direction is helping us better understand why the outcome of the power struggle was not definitely foreordained, why there existed several realistic alternatives...

It should be noted straightaway that there are no grounds for regarding 18 November as the beginning of a sovereign Latvian State. Let us recall once again: at that time the Karl Ulmanis government had no real power. Most importantly, it had no vote of confidence from the people. It is significant that at one meeting of the government People's

Council member G. Zemgal (future president of bourgeois Latvia) proposed that power be transferred to those in whom the people had confidence...

[Grigoryan] ...that is, to the Bolsheviks?

[Biron] Quite right. And Zemgal was not alone in his skeptical assessment of the abilities of the provisional government. Here is an eloquent admission from the organ of the Peasants' Union (Ulmanis' party), the newspaper LIDUMS. It commented on 14 December 1918: "The provisional government has no bread. The provisional government has no people. And without these things the provisional government cannot in fact be anything."

[Grigoryan] We know that the masses supported another force. Their choice was clear: power to the soviets! Let us take a look at how this slogan was put into practice.

**A Red Line Between the Past and the Future**

[Biron] Here is a brief chronicle of the events that, as P. Stuchka eloquently expressed it, drew a red line between the past and the future. On 4 December the Central Committee of the Latvian Social Democratic Party [SDL], together with representatives of soviets of workers' deputies from Riga, Valka and Leipaya, made the decision to establish a Latvian Provisional Government immediately. P. Stuchka was chosen to head the government, and Yu. Danishevskiy, Ya. Lentsmanis, K. Peterson, A. Arays-Bertse, Ya. Shif-Yaunzem and others were members of it. The SDL Central Committee's decision fully corresponded to the interests of the broad masses of the people; it had their confidence and support.

On 17 December the Latvian Soviet Government published its Manifesto, which proclaimed the establishment of soviet power in Latvia. This document abolished private ownership of land and introduced the eight-hour workday...

[Grigoryan] Does that mean that the framers of the Manifesto were confident that the soviets would be victorious, since they published such a serious document before a large part of Latvia had been liberated?

[Biron] Yes. The moment for an uprising by the working people of Latvia was approaching and the Latvian Rifles were coming to their aid. They advanced in three main directions. On 18 December Valka was liberated, Valmiera was liberated on 22 December and Tsisis the following day. By the end of December one-half of Latvia's territory had already been liberated from German occupation.

It is significant that on 22 December 1918 the RSFSR Government recognized the independence of the Socialist Soviet Republic of Latvia. A decree signed by Lenin stated: "The Russian Soviet Government recognizes the

independence of the Soviet Republic of Latvia and, until a congress of soviets is convened, the authority of the government of Latvian workers and landless peasants headed by Comrade Stuchka."

[Grigoryan] What were the forces in the opposing camp? Did the nominally existing bourgeois government take any steps at all to prevent the establishment of a soviet government?

[Biron] Yes, and very serious ones. But in that situation they were absolutely fruitless. First of all it turned to the imperialist powers, including representatives of Germany, asking for military aid. I recall that on 7 December an agreement was reached with A. Winnig, Germany's plenipotentiary in the Baltic region, concerning the creation of a *Landeswehr*. But these and other efforts by Ulmanis all failed. The advance of the Latvian Rifles and the uprising by revolution-minded workers in Riga, which began on 3 December, were the final acts in a short and tumultuous finale. The bourgeois government headed by K. Ulmanis fled from Riga to Liepaya, where for a time it met on board the steamship "Saratov" under the protection of English and French warships.

### The First Steps

[Grigoryan] Thus, we should emphasize in view of our previous conversation that it is 17 December that should be regarded as the day when an independent Latvian Soviet Republic was proclaimed. Naturally this does not in any way diminish the significance of another notable date: 13 January 1919. On 13-15 January a Congress of Latvian Soviets was held. It approved the 17 December Manifesto and adopted a constitution... In January the revolutionary process begun the previous December was completed. People settled down to day-to-day business. How, exactly?

[Biron] The congress—attended, incidentally, not only by Ya. M. Sverdlov (that is a well-known fact) but also by L. B. Kamenev—stressed that Latvia was not alone. Alongside it stood Soviet Russia. A unanimous resolution on relations with Soviet Russia pointed out the need for a close union between the soviet republics on the basis of proletarian internationalism and friendship among peoples. Then as now these fundamental principles were the basis for social, economic and cultural construction.

[Grigoryan] Naturally there is a difference between the goals set then and now.

[Biron] Of course. The first order of business then was to think about their daily bread, in the most literal sense of the phrase. Therefore the primary issue was the question of food. Emergency measures were taken to deal with the problem. A Food Commissariat was established under R. Eykhe. A food tax was introduced: six poods [1 pood = 16.38 kilograms] of grain from each *dvoryatina* [1.08

hectares] under cultivation. But this measure was sabotaged. The 20,000 poods thus collected would suffice for only one-and-a-half days. In order to end the sabotage the government began to requisition bread and declared a monopoly on potatoes, sugar, salt, bread and alcoholic beverages... But still this was not enough. In order to save the working people from the threat of famine the Food Commissariat opened public kitchens in Riga where tens of thousands of Riga's citizens received a soup ration.

[Grigoryan] We know that the young republic received as much help as possible at this difficult time.

[Biron] That played a role in overcoming the food crisis, although Soviet Russia, forced to defend itself against enemies on every side, was in a state of severe devastation that left it virtually without a crumb to spare. However, while noting this fact we should not forget that the most acute need was overcome thanks to corrections made by the government in its food policy. Specifically, at the end of April 1919 the government permitted free trade of meat, milk and vegetables at market prices...

In the spring of 1919 the soviet government energetically set to work rebuilding Latvia's economy. An Economic Council was established, whose job it was to organize production, planning and monitoring of enterprises' operations.

[Grigoryan] Considering the situation that existed in Latvia at the beginning of 1919 can one speak of existing enterprises or monitoring of their operations, when all around there was terrible devastation brought on by the war?

[Biron] We must also take into account the fact that in 1915 the equipment and personnel of hundreds of plants and factories were moved eastward, into central Russia. Let us take a look at the figures. A total of 537 industrial enterprises were evacuated, and 30,000 railway cars loaded with machinery, machine tools and instruments as well as raw materials and semi-finished goods were sent deep into Russia. According to the most modest estimates the value of this freight was almost 200 million rubles. Therefore on 2 January 1919 the RSFSR Council of People's Commissars signed a decree that would account for the most important industrial enterprises taken out of Latvia in 1915. Soon there followed the decision to reevacuate 10 factories and plants. True, the soviet government of Latvia voluntarily refused, as it seemed impossible to effect transshipment on such a large scale.

[Grigoryan] What solution was found in this very difficult situation?

[Biron] The only one possible: all attention was focused on small enterprises. They could be put into operation quickly and it was easier to supply them with raw materials and equipment and thereby to create jobs,

which were in great demand on account of the unemployment existing at that time. It proved possible to reopen some shops at the famous Russko-Baltiyskiy Plant and at Feniks... "We," wrote P. Stuchka, "have opened up factory after factory and workshop after workshop, only 20 versts from the front line." Within five months 100 industrial enterprises were established and the number of blue-collar workers in Riga increased from 3,000 to 10,000.

[Grigoryan] What sort of changes were taking place in rural areas? Is it true, as is sometimes said, that P. Stuchka's government was unable to find the right approach to pressing problems in that sector?

[Biron] As usual, the truth lies outside the realm of ideological speculation. Let us consider the Latvian Soviet Government's stance on the land question, a highly important and urgent matter. It was dealt with by the Commissariat for Agriculture, which was headed by F. Rozin- Azis. At that time sovkhozes and tenant farms were established on nationalized land. During the period of soviet government 239 sovkhozes were established, usually representing associations of former hired laborers and small-scale tenant farmers. But they were supposed to turn their livestock over to the sovkhoz, since individuals did not have a right to keep livestock of their own. This was a faulty policy that was exploited by counterrevolutionary forces in their anti-soviet work. This statute was repealed on 1 May; after that time sovkhoz workers were permitted to keep a cow and were also given an opportunity to buy back livestock that they had been sold to the sovkhoz...

We need to go into somewhat more detail concerning the practical organization of tenant farms. This is not just a matter of academic interest, but of practical interest as well: today the problems connected with lease relationships (especially in rural areas) are timely issues for us. Thus, 70 years ago peasants who had previously owned parcels of land were transformed into tenants. They concluded a lease contract with the volost soviet for a period of one year. This document set forth the amount of the lease payments and outlined the tenant's obligations and rights...

Thus major changes occurred in Latvian agriculture. The land no longer belonged to German barons, and the peasants got a chance to work for themselves instead of for the landlord. But the soviet state did not grant land to the peasants, mistakenly classifying landless peasants as members of the proletariat. The excessively short lease period—just one year—was a serious obstacle to the development of lease contracts in rural areas. It aroused the suspicions of the peasants, who had striven since time immemorial to become firmly established on the land and to feel that they were truly masters of it.

[Grigoryan] In a certain sense this situation is being repeated, on a different level, of course. Today as well the length of lease contracts is one of the things hampering the development of lease relationships on the land. It

is significant that currently a legal standard is being drawn up which will even permit a transition to indefinite leases, with a right to inherit leased land.

[Biron] We face a natural parallel. Once again this confirms the well-known thesis which says that history is not a storehouse of information and facts. It is a living science, helping us to better understand the present through knowledge of the past and to set a more exact course toward the future.

But let us return to the year 1919. Even as it implemented highly urgent measures designed to provide the population with jobs and bread, the government of Soviet Latvia did not forget about education and culture. It was at that time that ethnic-language schools were developed. A university was established using the Riga Polytechnical Institute as a base.

Notable steps were also taken in the arts. A Workers' Theater opened in February 1919; it was established at the initiative of A. Upit, at that time head of the Art Department of the Commissariat for Education. A Soviet Latvia Art Museum was established, as was an Academy of Arts and a State Opera...

[Grigoryan] Just the things you have listed are quite impressive. And all that was accomplished in just five months.

#### A Fortress Under Siege

[Biron] When evaluating what Latvia's soviet government achieved in such a brief period of time we should not forget the circumstances under which the new people's government was forced to operate. Latvia was in an extremely difficult situation. The Entente and Germany did not intend to sit still for the loss of the Baltic states. The area around Liepaya was in the hands of the Germans, and from there a blow against the achievements of the revolution was being planned. Latvia was being attacked from the north by the White Guards and from the west and south by the 6th Corps under General Von der Goltz. The young republic was like a fortress under siege on all sides. On 5 February the soviet government declared Latvia to be in a state of siege.

[Grigoryan] Let us go into a little more detail concerning the chronicle of attacks on Soviet Latvia. Essentially the new government did not even have five months of peaceful construction, as is commonly assumed.

[Biron] In fact the period was somewhat shorter. In February 1919 General Goltz's corps commenced active military operations. White Estonian units had already penetrated Latvian territory from the north. The White Poles were approaching the borders of Latvia from the south. Despite the courageous resistance by the units of Soviet Latvia's army they were forced to retreat under



the onslaught of the enemy's superior forces, among which General Goltz's troops were undoubtedly the shock unit; they were the troops who captured Yelgava on 19 March.

[Grigoryan] But there are also other viewpoints.

[Biron] Yes, there are. But facts are stubborn things. Our press has published a lot of them. I recall in particular an assessment given by the acting chief of the American Baltic Mission, Lt. Col. Uarvik??? Green. This cynic, who had the pleasure of participating in the firing-squad execution of Bolsheviks in Riga, was also a realistic politician who very accurately appraised the situation in the spring of 1919. This is what he emphasized in his report: "The Germans hold a commanding position, since they are a force here and the Latvian Army has been destroyed as a military factor... Naturally this creates an extremely difficult and abnormal situation, since the Latvian people have historically held anti-German sentiments."

Riga fell on 22 May. At the end of 1919 large White Polish and White Latvian forces commenced their assault on Latgale, the last bastion of Soviet Latvia. By the beginning of 1920 a large portion of Latgale was in the hands of the counterrevolution. In view of the situation Soviet Russia suggested on several occasions during these extremely difficult months that Latvia make peace. At the end of 1919 negotiations with the Ulmanis government began. These negotiations resulted in the signing of a peace treaty on 11 August 1920.

[Grigoryan] Now all that remains is to sum up.

[Biron] In my opinion the principal outcome was the fact that the establishment of a Latvian Soviet State in 1918-1919 was a natural continuation of the revolutionary process begun in October 1917, that the Socialist Soviet Republic of Latvia was a legitimate successor to the Iskolat Republic [Bolshevik-dominated Latvian government, 1917].

[Grigoryan] That relationship is still not quite so self-evident to some people.

[Biron] I admit that we have not always convincingly and brilliantly proved this, and of course our opponents, Western historians in particular, have taken advantage of that fact. I can also accept their reproaches that until quite recently we continued to leave out some pages from the book of the past, or else hastily skipped over them. Now the "blank spots" are disappearing from the map of history; more and more new facts are becoming known to science. Thus we are getting more and more opportunities to affirm the historical truth through a dignified and well-reasoned dialogue with our foreign colleague as well as our "homegrown" opponents, who often attempt to interpret the past in favor of individual groups' interests.

[Grigoryan] Thank you for talking with me.

#### Historian Affirms Distinction Between Romanian, Moldavian Cultures

18000358a SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian  
17 Dec 88 p 3

[Article by N. Babilunga, candidate of historical sciences: "Affirming Restructuring Through Concrete Action": "Science is Not a Game of Building Blocks: Do the Moldavian People Have a History of Their Own?"]

[Text] The article which is here presented to the readers of SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA was written in late October of this year in response to an article by Professor I. Buga that appeared in the newspaper NARODNOYE OBRAZOVANIYE under the title "One Language, One Alphabet." At that time I submitted this article to the editors of NARODNOYE OBRAZOVANIYE along with a request that it be published as a rebuttal. Six weeks later it was in fact published under the heading "Based on Arguments" (see NARODNOYE OBRAZOVANIYE No 100, 14 December 1988). However, it had been abridged in a manner that I feel was unjustified and contained a number of editorial errors and typographical errors resulting from the editing process.

I ask that the following version of my article be regarded as its genuine text.

...

They say that truth is born of argument. As a historian I prefer a different version of this saying: fruitless arguments are a waste of time, and truth is born of research—serious, objective, convincing research. It makes no sense to take part in "discussions" that by their nature and form are actually more like fights.

It was something else that prompted me to take up my pen. The author of the article "One Language, One Alphabet" (published in NARODNOYE OBRAZOVANIYE on 19 October 1988) is Ion Buga, a historian, and things that could be forgiven a layman cannot be forgiven a historian, as readers could get the idea that the level of scientific accuracy in the views of the author, who is a professor and doctor of historical sciences, reflects the overall level of historical research in Moldavia. That is far from the truth.

True, the author of the article did state honestly that he did not claim that his "personal opinions" were the absolute truth and invited a broad dialogue with readers. Within the framework of that dialogue I would like to offer some of my own thoughts on the questions discussed in his article; generally these thoughts as well lay no claim to the status of absolute truth, but I am firmly convinced that they are correct. I would like to state right away that I will not go into linguistic issues, of which I have only a very superficial knowledge and on which I do not feel capable of publicly expressing an opinion.

I think that the question of whether to grant the status of "official language" to one language or another should, if there is such a burning need for the matter to be dealt with at all, be decided only after thoughtful, well-balanced study of all aspects of such a step, study that would preclude any possibility of oppression of or infringement on the interests of any ethnic group, any group of people or any individual, especially in regions such as ours that have a multiethnic history; this decision should be made after public discussion and, if necessary, a referendum.

I will not dispute the author's statement that there is a need to preserve historical, architectural and other monuments of our region. There can be no divergence of opinions on this point. However, I would like to make a few specific comments.

Concerning the Romanian-language inscription on the base of the A. S. Pushkin monument, the author seems to have forgotten to inform his readers that it was not put there in 1885, when the monument was erected, but much later, after Romanian troops had put down the socialist revolution in Moldavia, i.e. during the period when the area was under boyar occupation. An important detail, is it not? Though of course there was no point in removing the inscription.

I also agree with the author that poor Mercury on the former bank could have been allowed to keep his sack of money. Would world-renowned personalities really have lost their creative abilities in the Organ Hall merely because the symbol on its dome (the god of trade holding a sack of money over his head) would be more appropriate for a cooperative discotheque than for a temple of the classical arts?!

But do these examples attest, as the author claims, to "silent, well-planned and well-organized destruction of monuments to the history and culture of the Moldavian people"? Who planned and who organized this chilling scenario—was it the "Masons" again, or was it the "Russifiers" this time? Of course, someone could have and really even should have raised their voice in defense of Mercury's moneybag. But when we are losing a dozen truly valuable, unique historical and cultural monuments each year, when entire monasteries, true gems of our land, are not being restored or developed, when the Society for the Preservation of Monuments is faced with dozens of highly difficult tasks and only a handful of dedicated people are attempting by any means possible to save something at least despite our indifference, one should try to get closer to the heart of the matter than the "problem" of Mercury's sack or a granite plaque eulogizing Brezhnev; in any event, one should not disdainfully call people with whose work and whose problems the author is obviously unacquainted "preservationists."

Naturally the rules of polemical debate do not preclude scathing characterizations, so long as they are not substituted for matters of substance. Probably in an effort to underscore the incompetence of the republic's highest

leaders the author states that "at a plenum of the Moldavian CP Central Committee Bodyul, a veterinarian... made the following statement: 'if we acknowledge that the Moldavians and the Romanians have a common language and culture, then what remains of the Moldavian nation?'..." We will return to the question of a Moldavian nation. The fact that Bodyul was a veterinarian is indisputable, as is the fact that he unfortunately remained head of the republic party organization for too long. But Bodyul did not address the plenum in his capacity as a veterinarian; he did so as the first secretary of the Moldavian CP Central Committee. I think that what he expressed (probably after first consulting with his colleagues in the leadership) was not his personal opinion, but instead a collective opinion. So what bearing does his veterinary education have on the matter? Like it or not, let us acknowledge that this was not one individual's personal opinion. And that opinion has been supported and developed, with few exceptions, by everyone, perhaps including Comrade I. Buga himself.

Thus let us learn to take responsibility for our own actions honestly and openly, without laying the blame on "veterinarians" and other malicious individuals. Incidentally, when I examine the statement made by I. Bodyul in detail and without a categorical approach it does not seem to me so seditious or contradictory to the truth, because there are Moldavians and there are Romanians, whether some people like it or not.

Before proceeding to an analysis of the author's position on this issue, I would like to consider one other misunderstanding, to put it mildly, which has circulated in our press. I am referring to the article entitled "On the Matter of Correct Presentation of the History of Social and Political Thought in Moldavia," published in 1959 in *KOMMUNIST MOLDAVIA*; the author portrayed this article as well-nigh a signal for an almost uninterrupted and intensive "critical campaign against the most talented representative of the contemporary creative intelligentsia." I do not know whether the author has read the article in question, which contained a discussion of the need for careful and painstaking study of the heritage of the manuscript writers and medieval political thought in Moldavia and for elimination of "blank spots" (30 years ago!) in historical study of these topics; the article also gave a class-based assessment of the social and political views of prominent 19th-century Moldavian literary figures, labeling them bourgeois.

Generally speaking, I myself am no proponent of primitive class-based assessments of the work of great artists, who since Homer's day have not fitted neatly into the procrustean cubbyholes created by that sort of assessment; higher service to the muses has always required that priority be given to common human values that are imperishable for all times and all peoples. But the term "bourgeois" as used here does not carry the same negative emotional connotation as it does in the mind of people on the street; it merely links the social and political ideas of various figures with a certain era, with

certain class interests and so on, just as we recognize the era of the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, the Meiji Restoration in Japan, the Age of Revolution in Western Europe, the reforms of Alexander II in Russia, the reforms of Alexander Cuza in Romania, etc. as outstanding events in the history of peoples precisely because they were of a bourgeois essence and orientation. We regard the bourgeois content of 19th-century Moldavian political figures' thinking as progressive precisely because it was bourgeois, in step with the principal avenue of historical progress.

I assume that not even the most ardent admirers of 19th-century Moldavian writers would claim that they were proletarian thinkers or, on the opposite extreme, feudal thinkers, although I repeat that I am opposed to primitive class-based diagrams for analysis of the creative work of the titans. But that is not the issue here. I ask you: how could the aforementioned article, which contained nothing that could have provoked the "strongest" wrath and unleashed it on a culture, which, on the contrary, acknowledged the need for serious study of the classical heritage, how could such an article have been the catalyst for persecution when the article was published in March 1959 and the "persecutor" only came to power in May 1961, i.e. two years later? Incidentally, it was in 1961 that his imperious rage fell not only on writers and linguists but also on historians—on Ya. S. Grosul, N. A. Mokhov, Ye. M. Russev...

I feel that I must say a word about another matter as well. The author of the article "One Language, One Alphabet" concluded with this appeal: "The hour of awakening has struck..." A good appeal, no doubt about it. Yet not everyone was sleeping, and not everyone remained silent. At the beginning of the 1960's, at the very height of the "strongest" disgrace the experts who had fallen out of favor sent the Moldavian CP Central Committee a letter in which they expressed their support for the preservation of historical monuments, for a protective attitude toward the entire heritage that we have now almost completely lost, for the restoration of home of Andronikii Donich, a church attended by Pushkin, a number of historic buildings in the vicinity of the Ilinskiy Market, and for the creation of an "Old Kishinev" historical preservation zone. Who were the people who signed the letter? Ya. S. Grosul, Ye. M. Russev, N. A. Mokhov, P. V. Sovetov and others, i.e. the very same ones who were at that time being subjected to crude assaults in certain press organs by certain individuals who have today "awakened" from their long slumber and earned themselves a belated reputation as the long-awaited messiah who will save the Moldavian people and its culture, monuments, history and language...

Let us turn, finally, to the contention for the sake of which the author most likely wrote this article. I am referring to his assertion that "both Moldavians from the USSR and Romanians from the Socialist Republic of Romania are components of a single socialist nation inhabiting the territory of two neighboring sovereign

socialist states." In other words there are no such things as Moldavians, Moldavian history, Moldavian culture or a Moldavian nation; there are Romanians, Romanian history, Romanian culture and a single Romanian nation, a Romanian people, "divided in the historical past," yet nevertheless actively struggling "against foreign ethnic and social oppression."

This contention is no revelation per se. Furthermore, anyone who is familiar with present-day Moldavian studies in other countries is well aware that it is part of the arsenal of favorite tricks used in attempts to sow discord between the USSR and Romania on the basis of the so-called Bessarabian question. It was elaborated in detail by members of the old, orthodox Romanian historical school, who strove to find evidence of the existence of a Romanian people virtually back to the time of Jesus Christ, the first millennium of our era. Today all sorts of "Moldavia experts" in the West accept the work done by the "orthodox" as an axiom, especially when they are trying to come up with new arguments.

For instance, the magazine UKRAINIAN QUARTERLY, which is published in the United States (its cover proclaims that it "contains broad information concerning the political, economic and cultural life of the Ukrainian people and other peoples of the Soviet Union") made the following "revelation": "It is a situation unique to Moldavia that its people are not a nation. There exists no Moldavian nation or Moldavian language, this people does not have its own cultural heritage or historical past, because there is no Moldavian nation. ...Simply put, Soviet Moldavia is not a state and not a nation, but rather a means invented by Moscow to conceal the Kremlin's economic exploitation of the region."

Generally speaking the entire edifice constructed by the old "orthodox" and their modern epigones has already been examined in a number of serious works by Moldavian historians. One could cite the two editions (published in 1978 and 1986) of a major monograph entitled "Formirovaniye moldavskoy burzhuaznoy natsii" [The Formation of the Moldavian Bourgeois Nation] and the arguments and authority of its authors. But in this case there is no point in appealing to those works, since the author has presented what seem to him to be new conclusions in support of an old thesis. Let us examine these conclusions objectively.

There is the demand that "the Stalinist-Bodyulist concept of 'two nations—two languages—two alphabets'" be completely rejected and eradicated. Pardon me for asking, but what about the "pluralism of opinion under conditions of glasnost" so highly praised by the author when it comes to his fellow thinkers and himself? Yet for all "dissidents" he proposes "absolute eradication of their views"; does this mean barbed wire and the Stalinism all over again? The author cites the following conclusions in support of his concept (i.e. a single language—a single nation—a single culture). Assuming that



the language of Moldavians and Romanians is the same (in the author's opinion this axiom requires no proof, since television and radio broadcasts in Kishinev, Moscow and Bucharest speak for themselves), that means that Moldavians speak Romanian. Someone who speaks Romanian is of course a Romanian. All Romanians, no matter where they live, comprise a single nation. A single nation possesses a single culture: Romanian culture.

In I. Buga's opinion this matter has been settled and is no longer subject to debate. But what about those people who dare to regard themselves as Moldavians and their culture as Moldavian? Will their ethnic self-awareness also be immediately subjected to "absolute eradication"?

There is just one little fact which destroys the graceful harmony of this logical edifice that the author has constructed out of children's building blocks. Either false or through some oversight he calls those who oppose the "Bodyul concept" (and hence those who defend the idea that Moldavians and Romanians are identical) people who "defend Moldavians' objective truth and ethnic interests." (emphasis ours—N. B.) Yet according to the author's logic it is an objective truth that there are no Moldavians and thus they can have no ethnic interests; there are only Romanians and their ethnic interests. Or does the author know for a certainty that the Romanians would agree to be called Moldavians, since they are all united—after all, is it not six of one, half a dozen of another?!

Let us return to the matter of a single nation. I. Buga does not spare the dark tones in his description of his opponents: "Today this concept" (the existence of two nations, the Moldavian and the Romanian - - N. B.) "is a harmful political anachronism. The authors and defenders of this concept, which has an artfully camouflaged tendentious nature, once cynically exploited the masses' incompetence and the previous absence of adequate and objective scientific information on this subject." Readers will not be left indifferent by the author's sacred conviction that now the masses have finally thrown off the shackles of incompetence and awakened. I would be glad to share this conviction, but first I would like to know what kind of "adequate and objective scientific information" he used as proof of his thesis?

It is not difficult to see that the most important basis for his edifice is the idea that unity of language signifies de facto unity of ethnicity and hence unity of culture, etc. and so on. In light of this I would suggest that the author try his hand at modelling the following postulates using his methodology: William Shakespeare was a great American playwright (Americans speak English, therefore they are Englishmen, therefore they have the same culture as in England and the same classics, including Shakespeare); Miguel Cervantes was a Mexican author (the above again with regard to Spanish); Vasco da Gama was a Brazilian sailor (on the basis of Portuguese); Johann Strauss was the German waltz king (on account of the German language), and so on, ad infinitum.

Although, of course, closely related peoples descended from the same root can have classics in common (by way of example: V. Aleksandri, M. Eminescu, et al.)

It is interesting to observe how the author, attempting to give his creation added stability by applying analogies, the least scientific method, cites examples which would themselves refute his conclusions if they were used in a more correct fashion. He says that Spain and almost all of Latin America speak Spanish yet no one divides that language into Argentine, Mexican, Cuban etc. Splendid! But does anyone call Argentines Spaniards or Mexicans Cubans on account of the fact that they share a common language? And their ancestors came, so to speak, from the same "pot"—Indian tribes and conquistadors; their cultures are similar, as is their history and, once again, their language. Nevertheless they are separate nations. Thus go ahead and call the Moldavian language Romanian (let us assume that the difference is indeed so insignificant that it can be ignored—I repeat, I will not attempt to be the judge of that); does that mean that Moldavians, whose nation took shape in Bessarabia and on the left bank of the Dnestr, thereby become Romanians? And the Americans English? And the Brazilians Portuguese? And the Austrians Germans? Or the Canadians English and French simultaneously?

So as not to digress further into other equally "convincing" examples, let us stick to the author's principal argument, which probably seems absolutely devastating to him: based on the analogy (analogies again!) of the situation of Bulgarians living both in Bulgaria and in the USSR one can assert, he feels, that the situation of Moldavians and Romanians is identical, because "Bulgarians from the People's Republic of Bulgaria and Bulgarians from the USSR are two components of a single socialist nation with a single native language although they live in different socialist states." Here as well language serves as the principal and only characteristic of a nation. We have come to the heart of the matter.

I do not know how I. Buga teaches CPSU history at his VUZ, but I think that every one of his students probably knows that in the scientific sense nations are by no means merely a group of people who speak the same language. On an exam they would define a nation as a socioeconomic community of people which comes into being only under capitalism (or socialism), i.e. when there is adequate development of productive forces to ensure distribution of labor and the formation of a unified market within national boundaries on the basis of a common territory and a common language (the latter condition, incidentally, is not always essential, with Switzerland, Canada and other countries having a multilingual national structure the proof), a common economy and psychology and a common culture. Some students would probably add that only the aggregate of all these conditions can form a nation, and the primary

condition is not a common language, but rather a common socioeconomic and intellectual life within the bounds of unified ethnic, customs or state boundaries. When the English migrated to Australia and America they gradually formed their own nations there: the Australian and the American nations. And if a part of the Bulgarians leave their country they de facto cease to belong to the Bulgarian nation, although they continue to belong to the Bulgarian nationality. Not to mention the fact that those Bulgarians left their homeland at a time when the Bulgarian nation did not yet exist; it was merely a feudal people.

In view of this the students would also explain their professor's inability to understand whether there are one or two Bulgarian nations: "It is absurd to claim that the native population of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Bulgarians living in the USSR are today two different nations and that they have two different native languages." Indeed, there are not two nations, since the Bulgarians have never established or held a national-territorial state entity anywhere except in Bulgaria. Therefore there is only one Bulgarian nation—in Bulgaria—and the Bulgarians who live in the USSR are not a nation. The Bulgarians who have long lived together in Moldavian territory as a compact population are a distinct ethnic community, an ethnic group, but they are by no means a nation, since they do not possess the necessary preconditions for the formation of a nation. There is no doubt that the students would explain to their professor that the Jews, who live in many countries around the world, are also not a nation, since they do not possess a common territory, economic system, etc.

Probably after hearing these conclusions the author would no longer attempt to shore up his construction, which he calls "an objective reality" (a single socialist nation—a single language—a single alphabet) with the very shaky buttresses of historical analogies. However, the author devoted a minuscule amount of attention to history per se—only a single sentence. Referring to the existence of Moldavians, Bessarabians, Bukovinians, Muntenians, Transylvanians, Oltenians, Ardelians et al., the author had this to say: "It is a well-known fact that in an historical process this population of Daco-Getaeo-Roman origin was consolidated into a single people bearing a common name: the Romanian people."

It is hard to say where the author got such an interesting fact, what research he did or what references he consulted. But Marxist historical science knows something different: that the Romanized Getaeo-Dacian tribes formed the new ethnic community of the Eastern Ruman peoples in the Carpathian region in the 6th-8th centuries after many centuries of contact with Slavs who had settled in the Balkans; this new formation is known to the world as the Vlachs. Subsequently a portion of them separated from the rest, settled in the Dnestr-Carpathian lands, came into contact with the East Slavs and gradually consolidated into the Moldavian people.

Thus in the 14th century there arose two separate principalities—the Moldavian and the Wallachian, on the basis of which there occurred further consolidation of the East Ruman peoples, the Moldavians and the Wallachians, who were undoubtedly closely related in terms of their history, culture etc.

After the liberation of Bessarabia from the Turkish yoke and the annexation of this portion of the Principality of Moldavia by Russia the historical conditions under which Moldavians existed on either side of the Prut River began to diverge further and further. The unification of Moldavia and Wallachia in 1859 and the creation of the Romanian State led to the formation on the basis of the two closely related East Ruman peoples, the Moldavians and the Wallachians, of a unified Romanian people with national borders. Yet on the left bank of the Prut, in Bessarabia and on the left bank of the Dnestr simultaneously yet under different social and economic conditions and in a different intellectual atmosphere the Moldavian bourgeois nation gradually took shape. Despite the fact that during the process of consolidation of the Romanian and Moldavian peoples contacts between them, especially in the realms of culture, language, intellectual ties, etc., continued, although many classics were in fact common to both nations, that by no means signifies that a single Romanian nation took shape in two different states, under different social, economic and political conditions and within the bounds of two almost completely unconnected capitalist markets. That is truly nonsense.

If we consider ourselves materialists and adhere to a materialist interpretation of all social phenomena, then we must admit that during the capitalist period two nations formed under different conditions in different states. Their historical paths diverged to an ever greater extent, despite their common point of origin, their common language, their common culture, and so on. It is significant that after occupying Bessarabia in 1918 Romania was unable to integrate it into own system or harness it to its own team—there was too great a difference between in culture and structure—and instead transformed the region into its colony.

Of course, we could also preach diametrically opposite views, find a unified Romanian nation in the time of Burebista and Gaius Julius Caesar, and regard all subsequent history as a temporary (feudal, capitalist and socialist!) division of that nation. We could! We could do anything we liked. But even as we arrange these building blocks to our heart's content let us not deceive ourselves and honestly admit that we do not regard a nation as a category of bourgeois society that only comes into being in a certain situation and under certain conditions, at a certain stage in the development of society; let us rather cling to idealistic views, assuming that a nation comes into being together with its language, which is its principal and sole sign of membership, attribute and characteristic. Then at least everything would be in its rightful

place and it would be clear to "the gentle people" who is who, for what purposes and in what manner he is preparing to "actively participate in the realization of Gorbachev's restructuring."

There is one final matter that must be addressed. Now that certain press organs have started laying it on thick about the "bitter fate" of the Moldavian people one could get the impression that people have begun to lose sight of the horrors of three centuries of the Turkish yoke, 22 years of Romanian boyar occupation and three years of fascist darkness. Today the whole discussion centers on the "tragedy" of Russification, Russia's policy of colonization in the region, migration, assimilation, and so forth. Thus there is occurring a gradual separation of the Moldavian people from their own history, a reversal of polarity and nothing more.

Well, at least one of those who have "awakened" should recall what the Metropolitan Dosifey said: "Light shines forth from Moscow, spreading its rays and good name under the sun." At least one should remember that after the region was annexed to Russia it did not experience war for over 100 years, that the population was even exempted from service in the army for 60 years, that Kishinev was transformed from a wretched little town into a fully civilized European city, one of the most important in Russia, that in a matter of a few decades the region's economy grew strong and assumed leading positions within Russia after three centuries of crises and stagnation. Someone should recall that in the mid-19th century the region was among the top 10 guberniyas in the country in terms of its number of schools and the literacy of its population. At least one person should recall the distinctive cultural atmosphere and community, the intelligentsia, that formed in Bessarabia, recall the familiarization of the region's people with advanced social and political trends and the revolutionary movement; in the end the people boldly cast off in a single united, interethnic assault the cruel authoritarian system of social and ethnic enslavement of the working people, tore down the walls of the "prison of peoples" and in October 1917...

No, they do not remember. Therefore one must assume that these are all the landmarks in the history of that Moldavia which, they are attempting to prove to us, does not exist. It turns out that all that exists are a few blocks, combinations of which they are attempting to offer the Moldavians in exchange for their complex, difficult and, yes, tragic history, but a history which is their own, distinct. The question is, will the people themselves renounce their historical path? Will they agree to play with building blocks?

**More Letters on Khrushchev, Stalin, Brezhnev**  
18300225 Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 48,  
Nov 88 pp 2-3

[Letters from OGONEK readers on Khrushchev, Stalin and Brezhnev]

[Text] The November issue of the American journal TIME contains a reprint of part of my notes entitled "A

Pensioner of Union Significance" published in OGONEK. The text accompanying the TIME publication states that the reason for writing these notes was my meeting with the editor of TIME, Mr. Maller, in July of this year.

In connection with such a formulation of the question, I consider it necessary to make some clarifications. I wrote the material published in OGONEK in 1972 from a rough draft compiled in 1964, which in turn was based on several tape recordings dictated while the events were still fresh in my mind. These tapes were taken from me in 1970 by the authorities, along with the memoirs of N. S. Khrushchev. I was able to offer them to the journal OGONEK in their initial form.

In my notes I tried to describe only that which I saw and heard personally. I must say that today there are also other sources of information about the events of that period, as for example the interesting interviews with G. I. Voronov and P. Ye. Shelest.

During my meetings with Mr. Maller, the American side kindly offered, and then provided me with an opportunity to print my father's memoirs from the tape recordings stored at the Harriman fund. These materials, I might add, say much about events which today are presented with certain distortions by numerous memoir writers who once heard N. S. Khrushchev's recount. Primarily this is relates to Stalin's death, Beria's arrest, the Caribbean crisis, and other events, though in my opinion it would be considerably simpler to learn about all this from the primary source.

At that time, in July, the associates of TIME expressed their interest in my memoirs about my father. I agreed with them that such a book would be beneficial. However, no significant steps were taken.

I would like to add that my notes were inspired certainly not by "orders" from popular journals, but merely by a desire to truthfully recount the events which I had occasion to witness, since I sincerely believe that the events of the Khrushchev "thaw" period are directly related to the reorganization of the life of our country. Today it is of primary importance to remember the lessons of the past so as not to repeat the errors committed then, so as to use the accumulated positive experience in our common forward movement.

Sergey Khrushchev

...

The article by A. Minkin, "Shadow", appeared in issue No 41 of OGONEK. It stated that on 20 September of this year, a court case was heard in Moscow regarding of I. T. Shekhovtsov's appeal for defending the honor and dignity of Stalin. The newspaper IZVESTIYA and the journal NOVOYE VREMYA had reported this somewhat earlier.



All the articles express surprise about the rejection of the appeal. I believe, however, that there is no reason to welcome the decision of the court (in the form in which it was rendered). The fact is that any court decision must be based on proof, while certain circumstances subject to clarification in court must be proven with the aid of very definite proof. From this standpoint the decision of the court is clearly inconsistent.

If Shekhovtsov appeals the decision of the court, then most probably the Mosgorsud [Moscow City Court] will overturn it as being incorrect. The fact here is not only a question of whether or not the statute of limitations for bringing Khvat to criminal responsibility has elapsed. The main thing is that the court has not studied the primary documents dealing with those events. This, in turn, is due to the fact that all of them were sealed.

Specifically, the journal *NOVOYE VREMYA* pointed out that Doctor of Historical Sciences V. Polikarpov demonstrated at the meeting that "...in 1937 alone Stalin signed 383 lists containing hundreds of victims". Of course, V. Polikarpov did not get these data out of thin air. However, the court cannot cite these statistical data in its decision based merely on the hearsay evidence of the witness, even if he is a doctor of historical sciences. The court needs at least an archive report stating that Stalin's signature appears on 383 lists. In the ideal case, the court should be given the original lists for study.

The same is true also for the resolutions "to beat, to beat". Shekhovtsov's request (petition) for the appointment of a graphological commission of experts regarding these resolutions is not so much of a whim as it may seem to journalists. An expert investigation may be conducted also regarding those 383 lists. Moreover, if the court had the original documents at its disposal, it would surely appoint a commission of experts. However, everything stems from the fact that no archive will give the court either the originals of the documents, or copies of them, or even certification of the fact that they indeed exist!

That is the main problem! The documents, undoubtedly, have been preserved. The lists, the telegram regarding the use of torture, as well as the resolutions of special meetings are also being kept somewhere. But who has access to them?

The publication not of 383, but at least 20 lists with the resolutions of Stalin, Molotov, Kaganovich and others would be more convincing than the serious and honest speeches of Adamovich, Karyakin, Polikarpov, and Afanasyev (rector of MGIAI [Moscow State Historical-Archive Institute]). The same is true also of the telegram about the use of torture.

Today it is technically quite possible to publish all this in facsimile form publications. Yet why speak about this if we still do not even know the sad "statistics"—the most basic of basics. We do not know how many people were

sentenced to execution, how many to camps, and how many of the latter died of hunger, illness, or were executed at their places of imprisonment.

When we speak of Yagoda, Beriya, Yezhov, Stalin, Molotov, and Voroshilov, we encounter an artificially created shortage of documentary data. These documents cannot hold any secrets—neither military nor state. Nevertheless, they are not being published. That means someone must have an interest in their secrecy.

If we want to prevent a repetition of the cult [of personality] in the future, we must expose it fully and publicize everything associated with it. No legal measures will help here. As yet the law has not been able to control political power. The opposite is sooner true. The first step in exposing the cult must be the publication of the documents from those years.

Ye. A. Shchegol, lawyer, Kharkov

...

On 3 October of this year *TRAVDA* published the article "Time of Difficult Questions" by G. Bordyugov and V. Kozlov. One of the sections of this article was entitled "Whose Class Interests Did Stalin Express?" It says in regard to the latter: "It was not only he who 'molded' the mass notions about the leader, but the mass of new workers itself 'molded' the leader". This passage reminded me of something I recently read. "Stalin molded us, but we too molded him, and along with him our own fate. We molded it with our obedience, multiplying a million times over the evil power with our own power" (Vl. Sapozhnikov, "And Who, After All, Is At Fault?", *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* dated 24 August).

However, the similarity is purely superficial, in words only. In essence, we are speaking about something that is directly opposite. Sapozhnikov admits the share of responsibility borne by the people for the misfortune which occurred, while the two authors assure us that the misfortune occurred at the will of the people, or of a certain portion of them—the "new workers" who had emerged from amidst the peasantry. Quoting farther: "The leftist impatience, the desire to solve all problems with one sweep, grew out of these masses... Lenin thought of democracy as a school of civilization, basing his ideas on the desire of the foremost strata of the working class for control and for the creation of new forms of life. We cannot say that Stalin ignored these better aspects of the working class. He too strived to use them in the cause of transforming the country. However, the personal regime of Stalin, as a specific form of organization of political power, grew out of other tendencies which also existed in the young working class—the desire for authoritarianism and the psychology of the 'mistreated muzhik' [peasant] (L. Reysner's expression)".

In light of what we know today about Stalin and Stalinism, such affirmations sound unconvincing and even blasphemous. The question immediately arises: And whose class interests did Brezhnev express? "The young working class" by that time had grown old. A new generation had grown up, yet the methods remained the same.

Stalin and Brezhnev expressed the interests of the million-man bureaucracy which they had created, and no one else's. The image of the leader was "molded" not by uncivilized workers, but corrupted intellectuals. Well then, what should we do with the class approach (after all, the bureaucracy is not a class)? We should leave it alone. To paraphrase a well-known aphorism, we may say the following: That which exists is not divided into classes without a remainder. The remainder turns out to be human, national, group (including mafia), and personal relations. The sociology of power must take these into consideration. Stalin was a usurper. He seized power as a result of a turnover (which occurred, obviously, not all at once). He instituted camp-bureaucratic socialism which did not reflect the popular interests in the country. (Marx foresaw this possibility). The revolutionary task of perestroika is to return socialism to the people and to replace bureaucracy with democracy.

A. Gulyga, doctor of philosophical sciences, Moscow

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Ogonek", 1988

#### **Soviet Attendance at International Conference on Philosophy Noted**

18000240 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 4 Nov 88 p 2

[Article by A. Antonov, candidate of philosophical sciences, Vice-chairman of the All-Union Council of Young Scientists and Specialists: "A Time of Changes, Notes on the XVIII Philosophical Conference in Brighton" under the rubric "Academician I. Frolov: A New Way of Thinking in the Nuclear Age"]

*Now is a time of drastic changes for us, a time of ideas and a time of actions. Of course, I also mean actions in the sphere of ideas. This, you see, is also action of enormous importance. Our intellectual forces play an important role in this process and in the process of perestroika.*

We talk about a new way of thinking in the nuclear age, but there are already few who recall that more than 30 years ago, Bertrand Russell published a manifesto in London which contained these very words—concerning the need to learn a new way of thinking in the nuclear age. A philosopher did this and very many major scientists, including Einstein, joined him; a great philosopher, but nevertheless a philosopher, has accomplished this.

Both in our country and in the world as a whole, we are experiencing today a period of threats and of hope. A period when for philosophy the "hour of triumph" is approaching.

Of course, philosophy cannot save the world by itself, but the world will not be saved without a profound understanding, including also a philosophical understanding, of those threats and hopes, which currently prevail in the world.

It seems to me that young scientists should be able to become proficient in a new way of thinking, reject stereotypes, and maybe, at first, by avoiding inevitable eccentricities and searches for clear and simple alternatives without any validity, they will be able to continue the new ways in our theory, in the theory of socialism, and correspondingly in the theory of perestroika. And the participation of our young philosophers in the 18th World Philosophical Conference, which was held in August of this year in Brighton, England, has become corroboration of this.

One can argue about how much this or that philosophical school or line of thought was represented at the conference. One can argue about how thoroughly the themes of the conference were discussed and about whether many new ideas and interesting thoughts were heard. But one thing is indisputable—it was a real event. And first of all, because the human problem and the philosophical understanding of this problem was at the center of discussion. And also because such "stars" of world philosophy as K. Popper, P. Rikyor, Yu. Khabermas, and others participated in the conference.

The debates about the essence of man, about his abilities, and about how he should live in the world have not subsided over the centuries. And on this occasion no one expected that a common point of view would be elaborated. Given the variety of philosophical approaches, which exist in the world today, and the difference in initial principles and purposes, this would not only be impossible, but also unnecessary. More importantly, there was a dialogue, a free and well-reasoned comparison of points of view, and a search for new approaches.

This dialogue was useful to everyone. And not least of all—to us. Marxism has achieved undeniable successes in studying the human problem. But today a growing requirement for new attempts to understand this problem and for new foreshortened analysis, taking into account the radical changes in the world situation, is making itself felt. Our country is undertaking serious efforts to substantially energize the working out of this problem, and not merely in individual aspects of the problem, but with a comprehensive, interdisciplinary approach. The USSR Academy of Sciences has created a combined general studies program, "Man, Science, and Society". Young people as well as elderly and eminent scholars will develop the program—besides philosophers and psychologists, historians, sociologists, ethnographers, lawyers, and physiologists are being brought together.

The Soviet delegation was one of the largest in Brighton—more than 100 people, with young scholars comprising almost a third of it. Incidentally, this was the

first time in the history of these types of conferences. As a matter of fact, our delegation turned out to be larger than the British delegation, itself. Approximately two thousand delegates in all from 70 nations attended the conference. Speaking at the opening of the conference, Lord Elton stated that philosophy in the British Isles is experiencing great difficulties and the number of colleges with instruction in this discipline is decreasing. Moreover, the cost of participating in the conference proved to be excessive for many British scholars.

We sensed a sincere interest toward ourselves. And, as it became evident, the reason for this was primarily due to the reforms, which are currently taking place in our country. On the other hand, many of the speeches by the Soviet participants, as they say, "resounded" and did not go unnoticed. At least the resolution of the Presidium of the International Federation of Philosophical Societies is indicative of a serious attitude toward that which is taking place publicly in our country and, of course, that which is occurring in the discipline of philosophy. I.T. Frolov, academician, was elected first vice-president of the Presidium and Professor V.A. Lektorskiy was elected as a member. One more important decision was made: the next conference will be held in Moscow.

Thirty young Soviet philosophers participated for the first time in a forum of this scale. As a matter of fact, this is just another manifestation of the perestroika, which is currently taking place in philosophy in our country.

Quite recently many people could only dream about such a trip. It is no secret to anyone that a totally abnormal situation has arisen in a country, when scholars, and especially young scholars, do not have a real opportunity to associate with their colleagues abroad. Since the 1930's, the obstacles which were established also played their part in this. Trips abroad or visits by foreign scholars are still not the rule, but more of an exception to the rule. In my opinion, it is precisely the alienation of many branches of Soviet science, and also philosophy, from the world scientific community which has contributed to the development of stagnation, dogmatism, and doctrinairism in these branches of science. It is clear that the problem does not lie in this alone. New and effective means for expanding international scientific contacts are required.

I think it would be worthwhile to make the regular participation of our young scientists in international scientific forums, their scientific internships abroad, and the inviting of young foreign scientists to our scientific

institutions, a rule. Of course, this requires money, but it will pay for itself with interest. I doubt whether we could find a more profitable form of expenditures—from the standpoint of the future.

The All-Union Council of Young Scientists and Specialists is also taking steps to expand international scientific cooperation. In conjunction with the Bureau of International Youth Tourism "Sputnik" (BMMT), for the first time we will organize scientific-tourist trips next year for young scientists in order for them to become acquainted with the world's leading scientific centers. Incidentally, the present trip was organized at the initiative of the presidium of the USSR Philosophical Society and with the support of the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League's Central Committee and our soviet.

Young people have sensed their own importance and have sensed that they are not being brushed aside when serious matters are being discussed, but are being invited to participate in the discussion and to express their points of view and opinions on the problems, which are being discussed. I think we need more of exactly this type of approach with regard to young scholars, who frequently neither have an opportunity to express their opinions in the national professional publications, nor lead any, even small, research units. Often young people are not trusted. But they, themselves, frequently do not attempt to undertake anything.

Nevertheless, many young scholars have already developed into mature researchers. This also became evident at the philosophical conference in Brighton. Andrey Degtyarev and Yelena Petrovskaya presented interesting papers and after his lecture, Nikolay Ivanov received orders for books on cultural philosophical problems from two western publishing houses.

A new organization was created at the conference—the International Association of Young Philosophers. A decision was also made concerning the publication of an international journal for young philosophers. Soviet representatives were also included among the members of the association's leadership and editorial board.

Work is going on at the stage of discussing the journal's conception and its problems. The young philosophers want it to become a forum for discussion and pointed problematic debates, and for developing a dialogue between the various philosophical schools and lines of thought. Therefore, we are also requesting of everyone, who has an interest in the appearance of the journal,—forward your suggestions.

A. Antonov,  
Candidate of Philosophical Sciences,  
Vice-chairman of the All-Union Council  
of Young Scientists and Specialists.



**LaSSR Council for Religious Affairs Official on  
New Church Law, Other Issues**

18000326 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
9 Dec 88 p 4

[Interview by LATINFORM correspondent R. Ostrovskiy with the deputy commissioner for the LaSSR of the Council for religious affairs at the USSR Council of Ministers A. Kublinskis: "Perestroyka and Freedom of Conscience"; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA introduction]

[Text] The solemnity and scale of the 1000th anniversary of the Rus' baptism's celebration in the country have convincingly demonstrated that today reliable prerequisites for a complete mutual understanding and cooperation between the State and the Church are created. However, these new progressive relations must be secured by respective legal documents. The acting in the LaSSR since 1976 regulations for religious communities are obsolete and already for a long time do not satisfy either the Church, or the State authorities. At the present time, a new draft law is being prepared. The Church representatives and our republic's believers are actively participating in its development. The LATINFORM correspondent R. Ostrovskiy and the deputy commissioner for the LaSSR of the Council for religious affairs at the USSR Council of Ministers A. Kublinskis discuss this work and the new tendencies emerging in the relations between the Church and the State.

[Ostrovskiy] Arnolds Alfredovich, it seems that in the beginning of our discussion it is necessary to explain to readers, what the Council for religious affairs is and what its main functions are. I think that very few have a notion about it.

[Kublinskis] You are absolutely right. Very often we come across the fact that people indeed do not know what is the specificity of our organization's work. It also happens that people attribute to us some prohibitive and limiting functions, or they picture us as a certain organization hostile to the Church and believers. Possibly, this is connected with the regrettably known periods in our country's history, when the State authorities used illegal actions against the Church and believers and applied to them administrative pressure. Abandoned, demolished, and closed churches are the evidence of that. And today many people for some reason, most probably due to the lack of knowledge, transfer all these deviations and illegalities onto our organization. However, the decisions to close churches and to dissolve religious communities were made not by us. Of course, as the State government's component, we are also guilty to a certain degree for the mistakes that were made in the past. Therefore, we are trying in every possible way to support the emerging process of restoring historical justice, that is, to help the religious organizations and

believers to get back, where it is possible, the cult buildings and to maintain them in normal repair. This completely conforms with the spirit of the time and perestroyka.

The main task of our organization is to implement the State's common policy with regard to religion, the Church, and believers, and control the correct application and execution of the respective Soviet laws. Such an organization is necessary to assure that the freedom of conscience is not only proclaimed at the pages of laws, but also is implemented in practice. Thus, we are, in a sense, an intermediary between the State and the Church. And the existence of our organization is not by itself discriminatory to believers, because similar authorities exist in other countries including capitalist ones. Every religious association is interested in registration, because then it obtains an official status and falls under the protection of the State. In the cases, let us say, when there is a conflict with local authorities, believers complain to us, and our duty is to help them.

[Ostrovskiy] Nevertheless, from time to time negative assessments of the LaSSR commissioner's for religious affairs apparatus appear in mass media and speeches. Also, the Program of the Latvian Popular Front includes articles requiring the reorganization of the activities of your organization. What is your opinion of that?

[Kublinskis] Firstly, the words "commissioner's apparatus" are too high sounding. All our apparatus consists of several people, namely, two deputy commissioners and three inspectors. As to these proposals, we are, of course, aware of them. However, honestly speaking, it is not clear what their authors actually have in mind. That is, do they propose to include the Church's representatives into the Council or to create a certain permanent consultative body at the Council? By the way, the Catholics made exactly such an official proposal, while others did not support this particular proposal. In this connection, we should note that even in the past we never made decisions without the participation of those denominations which would be directly affected.

With regard to other issues of reorganizing our work, I will mention that perestroyka makes its high demands of us here too. The existing structure of subordination ties up our initiative and limits our rights to independently resolve problems without an approval by the central apparatus in Moscow. Indeed, do they know better the actual situation in our republic than we do? We were raising the issue of greater independence without any success.

[Ostrovskiy] While preparing myself for the interview, I met the heads of several Latvian Churches. The majority of them have expressed their bewilderment with the lack of consideration and haste in including the mentioned proposals into the Latvian Popular Front's program. In particular, the metropolitan of Riga and Latvia Leonid told me that it is impossible to publicly discuss such

questions without first obtaining opinions of the denominations existing in the republic. In addition, it was simply unethical, because one must have certain powers to act. The archbishop of the Latvian Lutherans, E. Mesters, also does not see any sense in clergy interfering with the Council's work.

[Kublinskis] There are no obstacles of principle for creating in the republic, based on an initiative of the Churches, a certain consultative or coordinating body of religious denominations. The archbishop E. Mesters was telling me that in some countries, which he has visited, national committees of Churches exist. These committees resolve their interdenominational problems based on an equal footing and approach governmental authorities with certain proposals, or projects. The range of problems being resolved by them may be very broad. Today, when the republic experiences an unprecedented increase in the social and political activities, the Church is trying to the degree of its competency not to stand aside.

[Ostrovskiy] By the way, about the political activity of the Churches. Talking with the high-ranking clergymen, I became convinced that they, while having their particular differences, are united on one issue, namely, that the Church should not allow itself to be used in the self-serving political struggle. Because already now one can see the dangerous tendency to use it as a trump card in order to gain a certain political capital. The Baptist bishop Ya. Tervit, for example, thinks that a clergyman must not be a member of any formal or nonformal organizations, because he has only one banner under which he may and must stand, namely, that of Jesus Christ. However, such a neutrality of the Church does not exclude at all its right to express publicly its attitude toward one or another social phenomenon and either to condemn or to support it.

[Kublinskis] One cannot disagree with the bishop Ya. Tervit. One can hear in his words the feeling of great responsibility for the Church entrusted to him. A head of any religious association, first of all, strives for preservation and strengthening the independence of his Church. At the same time, a clergyman's membership in a party or sociopolitical organization means that he accepts the duty to observe its statutes and to follow the program of this organization. Hence, it indirectly receives an opportunity to affect the Church and to exert pressure upon it. As to the Church, it always stressed that it is above worldly matters and clearly marked the boundary between the "God's city" and the "Earthly city". At the present time, some people are actively trying to erase this boundary motivated mainly by their personal ambitions. The archbishop E. Masters very correctly remarked that a paradoxical situation is emerging today, namely, in the past the Church was struggling for greater independence from the State, while at the present time, certain forces are trying to push her into a position, where it would make efforts to secure for itself a right to independently affect the processes taking place in the State.

Of course, these are interior problems of the Churches, which they must resolve themselves. The State from its side will provide them with all the necessary rights and opportunities for their normal functioning.

[Ostrovskiy] The heads of religious associations are hoping that the new legislation will substantially broaden the Churches' possibilities to propagandize their religious teachings. The senior preacher of the Seventh Day Adventists, V. Zilgalvis plans to publish a magazine or some other monthly publication. The Baptist bishop Ya. Tervit spoke about a possibility to use the mass media, namely, TV, radio, and the press. How justified are these hopes?

[Kublinskis] These hopes are justified to a great degree. Already now, religious associations are publishing their literature in larger volumes than before. At the present time, the issue of their use of other means of mass media in order to reflect the religious life in the republic is being studied. However, since the new draft law has not been published yet, it is difficult to discuss the concrete details, namely, how it will be implemented in practice and in what order. As you know, our country experiences shortages of paper and printing equipment. Probably, the Churches will have to overcome these difficulties as the lay organizations do. Such problems will be resolved by the respective State authorities with us serving as intermediary.

[Ostrovskiy] Arnolds Alfredovich, for all that, what are the real powers of your organization? I know that in Sigulda the local religious communities have found themselves in a very difficult situation. There, the Adventists, Baptists, Catholics, and Lutherans were forced to conduct their services in turns in the same building. The Baptists themselves would like to buy the building for their church, but the local ispolkom prevents them from doing that. Are the ispolkom's actions legal? And does the Council have the authority to resolve this conflict situation?

[Kublinskis] In this particular case, the Baptists have not yet approached us. Unfortunately, similar situations, although being quite rare, still emerge. We had to resolve a similar situation in the past. I think that the situation will improve when the Church associations will receive the legal person status.

In general, the most urgent problem today is the issue of churches, that is, their return to the former owners. Many communities experience difficulties with the cult buildings similar to those in Sigulda. The Pentecostals in Riga and Yelgava practically lost theirs. There are various groups of Baptists without churches and other groups, which would like to improve their "housing". These desires are justified and natural. Unfortunately, the immediate return of the buildings is impossible. Each case must be examined separately. Many of the buildings were substantially rebuilt and, therefore, will require

large financing to bring them into their original shape. In addition, we must build new buildings or find a space for the organizations located in these buildings at the present time.

[Ostrovskiy] For a Church the problem of teaching children the religion and basics of the faith is no less important than its social and legal status. This is a vitally important problem, because it is to a certain degree connected with the reproduction of the religion, that is, with what until the recent past, let us be open, caused an extremely negative reaction from the official authorities. According to the acting laws, the religious education of children is permitted only on a private basis. Are any changes planned in this field?

[Kublinskis] Today, one can quite often hear an opinion that it is necessary to introduce elective courses in the Bible and basic faith teaching studies in the schools. However, the majority of the Churches' heads in Latvia are against the teaching of such a subject in schools. They think that the school must be neutral. And there is another problem, namely, how to separate the children in accordance with their denominations. Indeed, children of the Baptists, Lutherans, and Old-believers may attend the same class in the school. Therefore, for these reasons, the most acceptable option is when parents themselves arrange with a clergyman the actual form of teaching their children the basics of faith. And this is absolutely correct, because this is in accordance with the Church and school separation law. And to my knowledge, it is planned to include into the schools' curriculum a course of religious history, where students will get acquainted with the Bible and religious arts.

[Ostrovskiy] Arnolds Alfredovich, what would you like to say in the conclusion of our discussion?

[Kublinskis] I would like to say several words about the basic positions that are proposed to be reflected in the new legislation. Thus, the Church will obtain the right to participate in charities. This means that its representatives will be able to work in boarding houses for senior citizens, to nurse patients in medical facilities, to organize charitable concerts, and use the means to their own discretion. Would you not agree that one cannot call the situation normal, when hospitals short of nurses did not have the right to use people's help only because it was coming from believers?

The procedure for registering a new religious association will be significantly simplified. It is proposed that the authority of a local ispolkom will be sufficient to resolve this matter. In addition, the territorial limitations for the community's organizations which existed in the past will be lifted. In my opinion, it is significant that from now on clergymen will receive the right to be a part of the religious association's executive body and even to head it. And the newly obtained church's property will belong to believers rather than to the local ispolkom.

Before the new legislation concerning the religious cults comes into force, all the interested will have the opportunity to get acquainted with it. At the present time, based on our initiative, discussions with the legal division of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet concerning creation of a commission for developing this legislation in our republic are taking place. In short, we believe that the new revision of the law will bring us back to Lenin's principles of the freedom of conscience with, of course, taking into account the present realities.

[Ostrovskiy] Well, we will hope that the past difficulties in relations between the Church and State will, finally disappear forever.

Thank you for the conversation.

**Priest Claims Social Needs of Clergy Are Ignored**  
18000281a Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 47,  
19-26 Nov 88 p 28

[Letter to editors by Pavel Adelgeym, priest]

[Text] Much is being written about the progressive tax levied on members of cooperatives, which is considered to be excessive. I want to discuss for comparison purposes another method of taxation. Although it has been in existence in the country since the 1920s, few have heard of it.

The tax assessed clergymen progresses from the starting point of 100 rubles a year. Priests do not receive an income in the manner of cooperative members; they are paid a certain predetermined monthly wage, the same as all Soviet blue- and white-collar workers. In most churches this amount does not exceed 100 to 200 rubles. Only in very rich churches does a priest's salary exceed 200. At 100 rubles a month, the tax rate is 18.5 percent, while at 200 rubles, it is 27.6 percent. In our country clergymen have been existing on a fixed income for the last 30 years. However, their income is taxed in accordance with a long obsolete financial statute whereby the assessment is based on annual income. Finance organizations perform the following trick: they multiply the monthly income by 12 months to arrive at the annual figure. On the basis of the latter, they compute the tax, which they then divide by 12 months. As the annual income rises, the progressive tax parabola becomes steeper. Thus, the tax on pay received by clergymen is much higher than that of cooperative members.

In addition, we are not covered by state-sponsored social security. From the legal standpoint, this means that the State does not accept responsibility for the life and health of clergymen. It does not provide us with housing or authorization to stay at rest institutions. All this is not available for open purchase. Distribution is strictly centralized and the clergy excluded. To obtain housing or purchase an automobile or authorization to stay at a sanatorium, we must resort to "iniquitous ways."



The social status of clergy still bears the stamp of illegitimacy that had its origin in the time of the personality cult. I should like to hope, however, that in the law-abiding State that our country is becoming this will be a thing of the past.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Ogonek", 1988

### **Bratsk Believers Given Church After Numerous Requests**

18000281b Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA  
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by V. Monakhov: "A Request Satisfied"]

[Text] The Bratsk ispolkom of the city soviet of people's deputies has passed a resolution to erect in a new construction area a church to be used for holding religious services. Preliminary work has begun, believers are soliciting contributions for construction, and an account has been opened in the local bank to receive funds for this purpose.

Baptists in addition to the Orthodox community are registered in the city. The Church of the Holy Assumption, which they own, is fairly modest; moreover, it is located some distance from where many believers live. They have been petitioning for many years to open a meetinghouse close to their homes, but their requests were refused for a variety of improbable reasons. However, the city soviet responded to their latest petition with an offer - to erect a substantial church.

"I can tell you without reservation that this resolution passed only with difficulty," said Yu. Filippov, ispolkom secretary. "Five times I submitted a draft for consideration by the executive committee, but the votes were equally divided. Stereotypic mistrust of believers formed over a period of years was to blame, even though they are also Soviet people and are participating the same as everyone else in perestroyka as it pertains to public and social life. The deputies had a difficult time overcoming prejudice."

The believers previously leased the building housing the Cathedral of the Holy Assumption from the State. The local soviet has transferred it to the church community on a write-off basis.

### **Believers Win Battle in Request for Registration, Church**

18000436a Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian  
11 Dec 88 p 4

["Is It Better To Let It Fall to Pieces?"]

[Text] We request that you send us a correspondent for the following reason.

In Sosnitsa, A. Dovzhenko's birthplace, out of 5 previously existing churches only one church, the Pokrovs-kaya, remains. And this church was let go to such a condition that it had to be closed in 1962. All the icons and equipment disappeared. And this historic monument was given to DOSAAF to use as a garage.

We believers asked that we be permitted to renovate the church using our own funds and that the church be turned over to us. This dilapidated building stands right beside a local museum which many people come to visit.

We turned over our request to the rayispolkom; there the request was examined for two months and then denied. Let it collapse into ruin rather than make the people happy for a bit. In the decision it was indicated that there is a church in the village of Zagrebel, 6 kilometers away. But there is not even a road going there.

N. Dronova

[Response] A. Smaglyuk, chairman of the ispolkom of the Sosnitsa rayon council of people's deputies, informed the editorial office that the original decision of 13 September 1988 had indeed denied the believers their request to register an orthodox religious association in Sosnitsa as well as their request for possession of the former religious building. Following thorough study of the question and taking into account the believers' wishes that their religious requirements be more fully satisfied, the rayispolkom rescinded its decision in October and petitioned the oblispolkom and responsible organs for the registration of an orthodox religious association in Sosnitsa and for handing the former church over to the association.

### **Book Examines Protestant Sects in Chuvashskaya ASSR**

18000436b Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA  
in Russian 25 Jan 89 p 4

["Chuvashskaya ASSR: About the History of Religion"]

[Text] The republic book publishing house has released a book in the Chuvash language titled "Protestant Sects in Chuvashiya". The author of the book is L. Braslavskiy, who researches religious sectarianism.

On the basis of sociological research, conversation with believers and the analysis of religious literature, the author reveals many new concepts and relates the history of the development of religion in the republic. The book discusses the fact that the leaders of a number of protestant movements in Chuvashiya, violating the existing law on religious cults, organize schools to give children religious instruction.

**USSR, U.S. Jewish Cultural Committees Sign Agreement**

18120052a Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English  
No 2, 15-22 Jan 88 p 2

[Article by Yelena Khanga entitled: "Preserving Jewish Cemeteries"]

[Text] The U.S.-based Joint Committee for the Preservation of Jewish Heritage in the Soviet Union, headed by Canadian businessman Albert Reichmann, President of Olympia and York Company, and the new Soviet Committee to Support the Preservation of Jewish Historical Monuments and Documents, chaired by Konstantin Kharchev, Chairman of the council for Religious Affairs attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, have signed an agreement specifying principles of cooperation.

The agreement is designed to promote cultural, interregional and business relations between the USSR, the USA and Canada, according to Reichmann.

For the first time ever, the airfield at Khmel'nitsky in the Ukraine received a private jet. After landing, Reichmann and his delegation took a half-hour car trip to the 12th-century town of Medzhibozh, once outside the Jewish pale and inhabited mainly by Jews. During the 19th century, many of them emigrated. During World War II, almost all of Medzhibozh's Jews were killed by the fascists.

The guests prayed at an ancient graveyard, the resting place of Izrail Besht, founder of Hasidism.

Noach Dear, Committee Co-Chairman and New York City Councilman, says the agreement is aimed at restoring and preserving Jewish cemeteries and other historical landmarks on Soviet territory. Many Jews living in various countries have ancestors buried here and they would like to visit. We know about a hundred or so places of interest to be rediscovered, restored and preserved. We would also like to undertake a search for ancient Jewish manuscripts and printed books. This work could cost millions of dollars, said Noach Dear.

**Seventh Day Adventists Perform Charitable Work**

18120052b Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English  
No 2, 15-22 Jan 88 p 10

[Article by Priest Mark Smirnov entitled: "A Right to Compassion"]

[Text] The Seventh-day Adventist Church has opened a theological-administrative centre in the Zaoksky settlement near Tula, two hours' journey from Moscow. The three-storey brick building houses a chapel, publishing department and seminary. The opening ceremony was attended by the representatives of different churches in

the USSR; Konstantin Kharchev, Chairman of the council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers; writer Albert Likhonov, Chairman of the Lenin Soviet Children's Fund Board, as well as pastor Neal Wilson, President of the Seventh-day Adventists.

The Zhelybino boarding school for learning-impaired children is situated in the Yasnogorsky District of the Tula Region. It must be said that the location is unappealing. Adjacent to the school is a settlement consisting of 25 homesteads. The nearest store is 4 km away. The boarding school is situated in a former children's orphanage built in 1896 after money was collected in the district for its construction. Years passed, and the former orphanage housed a children's home, then a school for the deaf and for those with poor eyesight. Since 1972 it has housed the present boarding school. The children are mainly local residents from the Yasnogorsky District, and some of the disabilities can be linked to problems such as alcoholism in their families, or sometimes to parents' incarceration. The school has a total of 120 pupils.

As one institution was replaced by another, the building became more and more ramshackle and the children's living conditions continued to deteriorate. Finally when the "sanitary norms" were violated to the limit and the sick rate among the pupils skyrocketed, the sanitary inspectors decided to close this institution. But a new school had to be built somewhere. And the boarding school went on functioning despite all the bans. The situation became disastrous. The regional television showed a sad spectacle: premises resembling barracks, beds standing edge to edge without even ordinary bedside tables.

In 1982 Dmitry Adams, a former director of the boarding school, raised the idea of building a new educational wing. No aid came from the district public education administration, so construction started with just the efforts of the personnel. However, because of the lack of building materials and manpower work on the project dragged out and then stopped altogether.

One cannot say what would have happened to the boarding school were it not for Yevgeny Zaitsev, a pediatrician at the Yasnogorsky district hospital. The young physician repeatedly visited Zhelybino and was shocked by what he saw. Zaitsev couldn't relax knowing that the children were sleeping in the orphanage's former church in overcrowded conditions, and knowing that the boarding school had no money to buy even a refrigerator for its medical room.

Here we take the risk of astonishing our readers. The thing is that Yevgeny Zaitsev, a graduate from the Gorky Medical Institute, found himself assigned to the Yasnogorsky hospital. He was known for his kindness and compassion and for being a Christian for whom compassion and helping one's neighbour was the essence of his religious convictions. To begin with Zaitsev told his

community—the Adventist Church in Tula—about the disastrous situation at the boarding school. His appeal aroused an immediate response: at a youth meeting Adventists collected money and sent it to the account of the Lenin Children's Fund, asking that it be used to help the Zhelybino school. Following that, Zaitsev (together with his friends, also Adventists), came to the director of the boarding school, Nikolai Svistunov, and frankly said: "We Christians want to help you. What can we do for you?" Svistunov replied sceptically that many people had already come and promised. Nevertheless, he didn't refuse the aid, although he thought that probably nothing would come out of it.

This spring trucks with workers and building materials became more frequent near the boarding school. Work began at 7 p.m. Nobody stood idle smoking, nobody saw drunk workers on payday. There was no payday. People worked for free. No miracle, simply the people building the new educational building were Christians sent there by the Adventists Church to help the children. In five months the sober, honest and hardworking people had built the school and had handed it over in "turn-key" condition. In the place where formerly one could have seen masonry overgrown with weeds and the foundation of an incomplete project now rose a two-storey building. The construction was headed by Vasily Novosad, an Adventist minister, who had built Adventist churches in Karaganda, Frunze, Irkutsk and other cities. Here, too, Novosad had turned up in the Tula Region not by chance: 60 km from Zhelybino he was overseeing the construction of the Adventist administrative centre and theological seminary. From the project came workers and materials to help build the school.

At first they planned to build only a one-storey boarding school, but then Novosad decided to build the second floor to present the children with a good gym. In reply to my question as to how he assessed such a quick and successful construction of the new block, director Svistunov exclaimed that it was a present that "dropped from the clouds."

I wonder how the district authorities will react to this construction carried out by believers? We have never seen anything like it before. For the first time a religious community was allowed to take care of sick children. But Nikolai Svistunov does not share my apprehensions, and believes that the main thing has been achieved: the boarding school has been saved. Besides, there is nothing wrong with having contact with believers. By the way, the Adventist Church is a member of the Soviet Lenin Children's Fund, the Soviet Fund of Health and Compassion. Svistunov hopes that the Adventists will continue to render voluntary assistance and expects that they will do capital repairs on the dwelling and also provide some medical assistance.

Here we could finish, but we'll have to disturb the idyllic picture. The thing is that the position of those working for charity is ambiguous: doing good, they risk violating the current legislation pertaining to religious cults, which strictly bans religious organizations from engaging in charitable activities. This doesn't match well with the current times: our society is impatiently waiting precisely such help from believers. Don't we have here what we call in moral theology "collisio officiorum," i.e., a clash of two duties: on the one hand, Christians must follow Evangelical ideals and do good. On the other hand, as citizens of their country, they must observe its laws.

I think that while preparing the draft Law on the Freedom of Conscience we need to include in it the religious associations' right to conduct charitable activities. We shouldn't restrict believers' desire to do good and limit their participation in compassionate activities only to a transferring of money to various funds.

#### **Church, LiSSR Temperance Society Collaborate on Children's Charity**

18000433 [Editorial Report] Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian on 30 December 1988 carries a 500-word article on page 4 noting collaboration between the republic's Voluntary Temperance Society and the Orthodox Church in the collection of funds for the children of alcoholic parents. The collection was begun 23 October at the Svyato-Dukh Monastery and continued in all other Orthodox parishes. Church functionaries, including secretary of the Orthodox eparchy's administration Archpriest Vasilii Novinskiy, deputy of the Svyato-Dukh Monastery Father Superior Adrian, and Archimandrite Mefodiy paid a pre-New Year's visit to the Shvenchyenelyayskiy Boarding School, bringing the children toys and treats to eat. L. Dmitrieva, deputy chairman of the republic's council of the Temperance Society, took an active part in the charity campaign and the visit to the boarding school. The article states that "even the severe black clothing of the clergymen" did nothing to dampen the festive atmosphere, nor did Father Adrian's difficulty in speaking Lithuanian.

According to the article, children at this boarding school come from various parts of Lithuania and are of various nationalities. Of the 257 children, only 2 are orphans. The parents of 106 of the children have lost custodial rights; the rest are abandoned children. The director of the school noted that the children need not only charitable donations, but "sincere human communion and spiritual warmth" as well.

A photograph accompanies the article showing Archimandrite Mefodiy wishing the children Happy New Year.



**Estonian Official Defends Republic Komsomol**  
*18000388a Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH*  
*in Russian 16 Dec 88 p 3*

[Interview with Tiit Veersalu, first secretary of Tallinn Komsomol Gorkom and Estonian Komsomol Central Committee Bureau member, conducted by Alla Medvedeva, SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH correspondent: "The Komsomol: Problems and Opinions": "The Estonian Alternative"; first paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] "The Estonian Komsomol functions under the political guidance of the Estonian CP while maintaining its own positions and rights with regard to the realization of its aspirations... The Estonian Komsomol participates in the development of party policy, possessing freedom of choice in its choice of tactics used to achieve the goals set by the Estonian CP... The Estonian Komsomol is a member of the All-Union Komsomol as a future independent union of youth organizations... The decisions of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee are, as a rule, of a recommendatory nature with regard to the Estonian Komsomol... The Estonian Komsomol acknowledges other progressive youth organizations and movements as equal partners..."

These are a few of the points contained in the theses of the Estonian Komsomol Program which was considered at the 7th Special Plenum of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee. The decision was made to submit the theses for broad discussion by the republic's primary organizations. The plenum approved the membership of a provisional creative collective called "Program" which is comprised of noted republic scientists—political scientists, sociologists and economists. This group was established for the purpose of preparing documents for the 21st Estonian Komsomol Congress, which is slated for next year.

A SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH correspondent met with Tiit Veersalu, first secretary of the Tallinn Komsomol Gorkom and a member of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee Bureau.

[Medvedeva] I would like to quote from a highly controversial article published in the republic youth magazine RADUGA: "...liquidate the Komsomol as a means of political control. Liquidate the Komsomol as a vassal of the party. Liquidate the Komsomol as a centralized state organization..." What are your feelings on this position?

[Veersalu] That is the position of someone who does not understand what is currently taking place within our republic Komsomol. I can boldly state that the Estonian Komsomol today is a political youth organization. This is also attested to by the decisions that were made at the November Special Plenum of the Estonian Komsomol Central Committee. They represented the outcome of broad discussion of the draft law on constitutional amendments by our republic Komsomol members. As the ESSR Supreme Soviet session demonstrated, our thinking was

oriented in the same direction as the Supreme Soviet's. Now we are in full support of the declaration on republic sovereignty approved at that session. We are certain that we are on the right track; we are well aware both of our capabilities and the republic's social and economic situation. And in defending the idea of sovereignty the Komsomol has finally expressed the real interests of an overwhelming majority of our young people.

[Medvedeva] The theses of the Estonian Komsomol Program speak of political independence for the Komsomol.

[Veersalu] All right, the Komsomol and the party... In previous years the party told the Komsomol what to do with young people. The organs of power carried out their youth policy through the Komsomol without bothering to inquire whether they had Komsomol support. In addition, no one was interested in whether the state's youth policy coincided with the policy that young people really needed, that they themselves were pursuing. In my opinion that is the main reason why the Komsomol has witnessed an erosion of its authority.

Today we are convinced that the Komsomol should carry out young people's own policy. It is the Komsomol which should show the party what our republic's young people need, how to guide the social and political processes that are occurring among young people. And the state's youth policy should be implemented by special state organs—a Youth Institute, for example—with policy developed on a strictly scientific basis.

The Estonian Komsomol is striving to become the political vanguard of young people, and that precludes a mass-oriented approach. In a one-year period the Komsomol organization in Tallinn lost 7,500 members. That not only frightens us, it is actually encouraging. Joining the Komsomol is becoming a conscious political step.

[Medvedeva] I have heard that until quite recently some republic Komsomol leaders were proposing that the Komsomol be dissolved altogether and a completely new organization founded, something like an Estonian youth league.

[Veersalu] That would probably have been the most appropriate solution. If the situation had not changed. If we were not now in full support of the Estonian CP's course. For only now can one say that the party and the people are united. Or, more precisely, that in Estonia today the party is with the people. Republic cost-accounting, for which sovereignty is a precondition, is the idea that has united our republic.

[Medvedeva] What is the status of relations between the Komsomol and other youth organizations in Estonia?

[Veersalu] The most notable of those organizations are the Green Movement, the Scouts and the youth section of the Society for the Preservation of Nature and Monuments. First and foremost we are striving toward cooperation with those organizations whose goals and ideals are similar to our own. But we do not reject the possibility of working in conjunction with the rest, for example with the religious movements on matters pertaining to moral instruction.

Our republic already has had experience with consolidation: the Estonian People's Front has an advisory council comprised of representatives of all movements, groups and creative unions as well as representatives of the party, trade unions and Komsomol.

[Medvedeva] What do you think is the optimal model for the All-Union Komsomol?

[Veersalu] I feel certain that we need to move in the direction of a federation of youth leagues. The All-Union Komsomol Central Committee should become a coordinating center and nothing more. Republic organs can develop better and more competently under local conditions than the "center" can. Therefore the command methods of leadership which the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee uses are inadmissible. Essentially they are inadmissible at any level: the republic Central Committee, raykoms, gorkoms and Komsomol committees should become executive, auxiliary organs which carry out the will and decisions of young people. Young people today are smarter, better educated and more politically experienced. And they know quite well what they need to do in order to further their own interests.

[Medvedeva] Thank you for talking with me.

**Voronezh, Tula Conflict Between Youth Newspaper Journalists, Komsomol**  
18000269 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by D. Muratov under the rubric "A Study in Democracy": An "Article" for an Article, Journalists at Youth Newspapers in Voronezh and Tula Were Fired Within Hours of Each Other"]

[Text] In November, the IV All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League (VLKSM) Central Committee Plenum discussed ways of democratizing the Komsomol. It was proclaimed in the address of V. Mironenko, the First Secretary of the VLKSM Central Committee: "It is difficult to imagine democratization in the Komsomol without the Komsomol press and without the objective elucidation of the policies and actions of the Komsomol committees, the opinions of the rank and file Komsomol members, the Komsomol activists, and the Komsomol workers and journalists concerning young people's problems and methods of solving them".

The Plenum proposed—if arguments arise between the journalists and Komsomol workers, to submit them to the plenum of the appropriate Komsomol committees. For the present such cases are unknown. And conflicts are flaring up in the provinces with increasing frequency. Today we are publishing material from the Voronezh oblast newspaper "MOLODOY KOMMUNAR", a letter from the employees on the editorial staff, and our commentary. The time has come to elaborate guarantees of glasnost in our association.

#### A Telegram to the Newspaper

On 1 December 1988, in accordance with article 254, paragraph 1, V. Kolobov, the assistant editor of "MOLODOY KOMMUNAR" and secretary of the newspaper's Party organization was fired for noncompliance with a VLKSM Bureau obkom resolution. The Komsomol obkom workers did not like the fact that he disobeyed their leading opinion and continued the discussion, which he was ordered to drop. Although, Kolobov, in acting this way, was not defending his own personal views, but the decision of the editorial board and all the journalists at the newspaper. I. Vorobyev, the Komsomol obkom first secretary, and secretary V. Kobylashev conducted themselves extremely disdainfully with respect to the newspaper. They did not explain their decisions. V. Kobylashev told the journalists,—"This is our newspaper and we will do with it as we see fit". Whose newspaper—"yours"?

Our position is in the commentary, which we printed on 1 December. As a matter of fact, it was for this position that Volodya was fired.

Aleksandr Buneyev,  
Section Manager,  
Yevgeniy Busalayeve,  
Section Manager.  
(14 signatories in all)

#### From the Editorial Staff of MOLODOY KOMMUNAR

We consider it necessary to put things right in the situation which has arisen around the "case of the Moscow Communist Party (KPM)" and A. Zhigulin's story "CHERNIYE KAMNI" which our newspaper has found itself involved in. ("KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA" wrote about this situation on 25 October 1988 in the article "The Second Attempt").

...From the very beginning this discussion was thrust upon the editorial staff. In three issues of the newspaper at the end of September, contrary to the opinion of the editorial board and the editorial staff collective, L. Korobkov's article "Old Wives Tale", which was written in an inadmissible tone, was published. After the article, the editorial staff was inundated with a torrent of letters and telephone calls from its readers. The editorial staff even received comments, which supported Korobkov, but they were few. However, the selection of comments

did not reflect the actual correlation of readers' opinions, since the MOLODOY KOMMUNAR journalists were not able to participate in the selection process.

Nevertheless, on 5 November, at the insistence of the VLKSM obkom secretariat the "discussion" was dropped and the editorial staff summed up the discussion in a proposal to create a public commission on the "KPM case". And on 23 November, V. Kobylashev, the VLKSM obkom secretary, handed the typewritten texts of letters from L. Zolotye and L. Sychev, two former KPM members, to the editorial staff and demanded that they be placed immediately in that day's paper. This was impossible for technical reasons.

On the following day, the secretary once again appeared in the editorial office with the same goal and alluded to the opinion of the VLKSM obkom secretariat. At that time the editorial board made the following decision: after publishing L. Zolotye's letter (in our opinion, L. Sychev's letter required the compulsory checking over), to also give other members of the KPM an opportunity to speak out in the newspaper, which up to now had been denied to them.

On the evening of 25 November, when the next issue of the newspaper was almost finished, the editorial office received a decree from the VLKSM obkom buro, which gave V. Kobylashev, the obkom secretary, the right to approve the newspaper for print. Taking advantage of this right, Kobylashev, without explaining his reasons and without listening to the arguments of the journalists' collective, removed a letter from eight members of the KPM and an interview with A. Zhigulin and editorial commentary from the newspaper's type page and left only the letters, which had come from the VLKSM obkom, on the type page. Thus, in the "MOLODOY KOMMUNAR" issue dated 26 November, new tendentious materials concerning the KPM appeared without any sort of explanation. Nevertheless, on 28 November, the VLKSM obkom buro adopted a resolution on "the inexpediency of continuing the discussion of A. Zhigulin's story, 'CHERNYE KAMNI'". This strong-willed resolution was aimed at once again depriving the editorial staff of the opportunity to finish the discussion which was thrust upon us. But for the sake of fairness, we decided to finish the discussion all the same.

(From the Voronezh Oblast newspaper  
MOLODOY KOMMUNAR, 1 December 1988)

#### Our Commentary

The pauper Marktvenovskiy, after being a prince for a while and receiving the state seal, found a safe use for it—cracking nuts. It seems to me that a similar inoffensive role for the youth press would suit many Komsomol "custodians of the seal" just fine. But the youth press is tired of cracking nuts.

The KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA articles, "Melee on the 'Rug'" and "People, Go Away!" provoked a whole stream of letters—journalists at the Perm and Kuybyshev "youth papers" without the celebrated reservation: "we are being quiet because we have to live here"—told about their conflicts with the local authorities. A now there is Voronezh. There is a whole phenomenon behind this situation. New ways to keep newspapers in check are being searched out. If only recently a verbal "tut-tut" had the force of law, now methods and procedures, which are democratic in outward appearance, are being set in motion. The resolutions of the secretariat and buro, which stopped the discussions, were adopted—in the literal sense by an overwhelming—majority of the votes and Vladimir Kolobov, the assistant editor of MOLODOY KOMMUNAR has been fired. All these actions are sanctified by a patrimonial interpretation of democratic centralism.

It seems to me: a method of speedy and legal reprisal against objectionable journalists. The method is simple and short. K. Kirillov, the executive secretary of the "youth paper" in Tula, who placed a paragraph in the newspaper asking why material about a political club was not published, was fired. The distribution of the newspaper was halted during the night, the remark was removed from the issue by the Komsomol obkom first secretary, and on the very next day, Kirillov was dismissed on the grounds of article 254 (part 1) of the Labor Code (KZoT) (having presented all points of view concerning this situation, we will also state—a VLKSM Central Committee commission and our correspondents were working in Tula). Kolobov was also dismissed on the grounds of article 254. Lawyers call this article "the article for insubordination". A supervisory worker can actually be dismissed for a single breach of official discipline without the right of an appeal in a court of law.

Up to now there are no reliable guarantees for protecting glasnost. At times local leaders interpret the resolution on glasnost as "stratagem"—they quote, allude to, and act randomly in accordance with the established traditions of the Party apparatus. I think the time has come to discuss the issue of the youth press at the VLKSM Central Committee plenum.

But all of this will have to wait. There is no time. And for the present we are paying for the lack of reliable guarantees with the destinies of courageous and talented people. We will stand up for them. So that we will not once again turn into "paupers" who are deprived of glasnost. D. Muratov.

**BSSR Notes Sharp Increase in Robberies**  
18000401a Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA  
in Russian 3 Dec 88 p 4

[Commentary by G. A. Krukovskiy, lieutenant colonel of the militia and department chief of the BSSR MVD Administration for the Protection of Public Order: "Alarming Statistics"; first paragraph is source introduction]

[Text] In November republic internal affairs organs received 239 citizen statements and reports concerning robberies, 42 percent more than during the same period



last year. A particularly large number of robberies occurred in Vitebsk, Gomel and Mogilev oblasts and in the city of Minsk.

Commentary by G. A. Krukovskiy, lieutenant colonel of the militia and department chief of the BSSR MVD Administration for the Protection of Public Order:

"The items most frequently stolen are cash, radios, purses and, as the weather turns colder, fur hats (16 have been stolen during the past week alone). As a rule the robberies occur on the street, in courtyards, in apartment building entryways and in deserted areas in the evening and at night."

"In most cases the robber is a young person under the age of 25. One criminal in five is a student at a vocation and technical school or tekhnikum or a secondary school student in the upper grades. On Lazo Street in Vitebsk on 27 November P., unemployed, and R., a student at Vocational and Technical School #147, beat up and stole a fur hat from a worker at SPMK [Specialized Mobile Mechanized Column] #25. On 27 November on Surikov Street in Minsk V., a worker at the Gorizont PO, while in an intoxicated state grabbed a fur hat from a female store employee's head and attempted to flee. However, he was arrested by a militia patrol unit 20 minutes later."

"As experience has shown, whether or not a robber is arrested depends not only on skillful action by militia officers but also to a large extent on how quickly the victim reports a robbery and how objective is the information he or she provides."

**KGB Counterespionage Mission Unchanged**  
18000401b Leningrad *LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA*  
in Russian 27 Dec 88 p 2

[Speech by V. M. Prilukov, chief of Leningrad Oblast KGB Administration, at 28th Conference of Leningrad Oblast Party Organization]

[Text] Of late we have frequently encountered the notion that supposedly the current foreign policy trend toward normalization of international relations lessens the timeliness of the struggle being conducted by state security organs against espionage and subversive activity against our country. However, in reality the situation is just the opposite. Aggressive imperialist circles have not yet renounced their hopes of social revanche. They are still attempting to build relations with our country from a position of strength. As before, their strategically hostile schemes are designed to weaken our defensive capability, hamper the restructuring process and undermine Soviet people's faith in the success of that process and in the validity of party and state decisions.

Despite the tendency away from a policy of confrontation that is observable in the world today the already colossal sums being spent by intelligence services in the United States and a number of other NATO countries on secret operations against the Soviet Union continue to grow.

At the present time the heads of American intelligence regard the creation of a network of agents in our country as one of the CIA's primary tasks. And I can assure you that that is not merely an unsubstantiated claim.

Recently there has been an increase in the number of recruitment attempts involving Leningraders traveling abroad. During the current year alone several dozen individuals with connections to Western intelligence services and ideological centers have been discovered in the stream of foreign visitors to Leningrad.

Our administration's personnel have repeatedly thwarted attempts by foreigners to pry into our defense secrets and other secrets and to obtain information about basic scientific and technical research. In view of the importance of the USSR's economic ties with foreign countries our Cheka agents are doing a great deal to prevent direct economic harm to the Soviet side. In the future we will continue, along with our interdiction of hostile activities by intelligence services operating through foreign firms, to uncover intentional efforts to supply Leningrad with low-quality, obsolete equipment and technology, expose attempts to unload dead-end ideas and reveal instances of payoffs to Soviet specialists and officials for the purpose of undermining our state's defensive and economic might.

In view of the dynamic development of domestic social and economic processes we regard helping party, soviet and economic organs solve major social and economic problems as one of our primary tasks.

**Abuses of Former MVD Chief Shchelokov Detailed**

18000347 Moscow *MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA*  
in Russian 7 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by Yevgeniy Dodolev under rubric "Fragments of the Past: About One of the 'Heroes' of the Stagnation Period": "Hunting For Himself"]

[Text] Yes, his name was invariably surrounded by rumors. In the latter half of the 1960s he began to be spoken of as "a new breed of leader, a minister with a non)standard mind." After November 1977 the minister's name was frequently mentioned along with references to "the in)law," which was understandable only to those in the know. The reference was to one of Shchelokov's new immediate subordinates, Yu. M. Churbanov, to whom he had, five years earlier, awarded the honorary title, "Merited Worker of the MVD." (In March 1971, Churbanov was appointed deputy chief of the Political

Administration, Internal Forces of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. A month later he married Galina Brezhneva. On that occasion he was promoted before his time to the rank of colonel; he became a major-general in 1973, a lieutenant-general in 1977, and a colonel-general in 1981. In November 1977 Churbanov was appointed deputy, and subsequently first deputy minister of internal affairs.)

The next wave of rumors was linked with Shchelokov's wife. It was rumored that Svetlana Vladimirovna had used her husband's pistol to take a shot at Yu. V. Andropov, who had begun an uncompromising purge of the corrupted MVD staff from the very sacrosanct top. That groundless gossip spread along with the quite authentic reports of S.V. Shchelokova's suicide. On 19 February 1983 she shot herself in the head with a gift gun known in the criminal argot as "solyanka" because it is a hybrid of two makes. Then, at the end of 1984, news spread of a "mysterious shot" which cut short the life of the once dashing minister. His name has now resurfaced in connection with the hearings of the so-called "Churbanov case."

Thus, this fall Shchelokov's name was mentioned in the Supreme Court building in a context which it was impossible to even imagine 20 years ago, when Nikolay Anisimovich became a member of the CPSU Central Committee (he had been a candidate member since 1966, and a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet since 1954). I quote from the preliminary investigation of the criminal case against Shchelokov which, I would hope, will clarify many things."

Shchelokov was given 248,800 rubles' worth of valuable antiques which were material evidence in the criminal case of currency speculator M. S. Akopyan. Initially antique miniature cabinets of inlaid wood, paintings, armchairs, and many china and silver items were moved to State Dacha No. 8 in Serebyanny Bor. Some antique valuables: a jade hippopotamus figurine with gold soles (estimated value 15,000 rubles), a jade tumbler, a seal in the shape of an Easter egg, a porcelain group "Napoleon's Retreat From Russia," and 9 different silver objects—to a total value of 42,000 rubles—were handed over to Shchelokov personally and were kept in a recreation room adjoining on his office. In November 1979, all aforementioned valuables were transferred on Shchelokov's instructions from the dacha to the official apartment on Hertsen Street. Subsequently many items of high artistic value were handed over to the Kremlin Museum, the Ostankino Palace Museum, and other museums. "But that is only a characteristic detail, a component of the general background against which various proceedings—no, not legal, but of governmental scope—unfolded.

It was Shchelokov who by his own example trained "all his king's men" not to notice corruption; he taught them the sardonic skill of looking with unseeing eyes at prostitution, drug addiction and other social ills. And

he trained his charges in the art of fitting plasticine statistics into a red-bunting panorama of achievements. It was the minister who turned the militia into a haven from any criticism. Most of Shchelokov's former subordinates characterize him as having been an able, educated man and good organizer. At one time pungent odors of evil rumors began to emanate from Moldavia, where he had worked prior to his appointment to the national ministerial position as second secretary of the republican Central Committee, but that piece of gossip quickly dissipated. He became minister in 1966, and in March of the following year found himself a talented assistant who wrote his speeches and reports. This man was Sergey Mikhaylovich Krylov, future organizer of the MVD Academy. (Shchelokov later betrayed and abandoned him during a vile and slanderous campaign against an honest professional which propelled him to tragic suicide in 1979.)

Initially, they say, Shchelokov behaved rather modestly and, by ably exploiting Krylov, earned respect and authority in the eyes of his subordinates. The predatory traits of his dual personality—grasping greed and unscrupulousness so typical of those years—began to manifest themselves later. He was, probably, a typical executive of the Brezhnev era, with all the qualities that characterized the years of stagnation.

It was no secret to anyone in the Ministry that Shchelokov became a minister thanks to Brezhnev's personal intervention, that their families were close and even lived in the same house. In his work the successful minister played by the rules of the Brezhnev-Suslov game, trying not to cloud the overall rosy picture of ostentatious well-being, and firmly and deliberately steering his subordinates in the same direction.

It is apparent from the testimony of a former employee of the Armenian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs that in 1971, while in Yerevan, Shchelokov had offered the republican minister to purchase a painting by M. Saryan, "Wild Flowers," which had caught his eye, and send it to Moscow. The painting was purchased for 10,000 rubles, paid by the ministry, and handed over to Shchelokov. The fact that the republican MVD had purchased the painting for the aforementioned sum is confirmed by a written contract included as evidence in the case, as well as by a statement by a former deputy minister of internal affairs of Armenia. In August 1973 the magazine SOVETSKAYA MILITSIYA printed a reproduction of "Wild Flowers" accompanied by a laudatory article about Saryan which stated that he had presented the painting to the ministry and it was in the repository of the Central Museum of the MVD. According to a statement by the editor-in-chief, the publication had been authorized by Shchelokov. And the picture ended up not in the museum but at the Shchelokov family's personal dacha in Bolshevo.

The minister's "love of art" manifested itself in other ways as well. He was, it seems, fully prepared to assume the role of an actor himself.

"On Shchelokov's instructions, the MVD Film Department produced a two-series film, 'Pages of Life,' about his own life story. An audit has established that the cost of the film exceeded 50,000 rubles.

"In general, the minister did not bother to keep track of government money. On his instructions a certain Yu. A. Ye. was hired as a laboratory assistant at the MVD All-Union Scientific Research Institute and authorized the use of a Zhiguli car. Actually, Ye. testified, he performed the duties of a personal masseur for the Shchelokov family. In 1980, on Shchelokov's orders Ye. was given a two-room apartment.

"From August 1980 through January 1983, on Shchelokov's instructions citizen L. N. A., who performed personal assignments for the ex-minister, was provided with free lodging at the official dacha." In October 1982, on Shchelokov's orders he was enrolled in MVD service. At the same time he was given the rank of militia colonel.

Shchelokov invariably shielded those for whom he felt empathy. As for those who irritated him with their principled views, he calmly and often gloatingly hounded them. That is what happened, for example, with the well-known Colonel A. F. Bazilevich who, despite the warnings of well-wishing courtiers, went too far in his investigation and uncovered clear leads of vertical corruption leading to the very top. The minister knew Bazilevich personally, even gave him an audience at which he listened to all the details of behind-the-scenes pressure on the investigation, which had "gotten out of hand." But he saw no need to stand by his subordinate and refused to move a finger to rescue the colonel when the latter ended up behind bars.

Viktor Vasilyevich Naydenov, deputy prosecutor-general of the USSR, was also summarily hounded with the full knowledge of the Minister of Internal Affairs' ranking coterie. Initially Naydenov was brought to one of the closed Sochi dachas, where one of the "co-conspirators," Medunov, and his associates tried to persuade him to mend his ways. At the time a strange conference of MVD workers was called in Sochi, apparently with the purpose of quashing the "Krasnodar case," which was unraveling at the time.

"We have brought legal norms in accord with the new level attained by our society," declared the star-spangled General Secretary from the rostrum of the 25th Party Congress. A new level! It was the beginning of 1976. The ink had hardly dried under the Supreme Court's sentence with regard to Chairman of the Uzbekistan Council of Ministers R. K. Kurbanov when Brezhnev's signature was applied to a decree pardoning him. All over the country the most timid attempts of workers of the prosecutor's office to institute criminal proceedings against high-ranking embezzlers were greeted with hypocritical cries about "attempts to revive the traditions of 1937." (That, incidentally, was one of Medunov's arguments.) Thus the heirs of Stalin sought to intimidate a

lethargically unconcerned public with the bloody ghost of the NKVD, finally pull the wool over its eyes and quell ramblings of dissatisfaction, leaving themselves free to do what they would: Eliminate the obstinate and steal, steal enough to bequeath to their grandchildren and even great-grandchildren.

In 1972, a department store branch was opened on Shchelokov's instructions, ostensibly "to serve operative personnel." By agreement with the leadership of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and the Raznoeksport and Tsentrosoyuz foreign trade associations, its counters were regularly stocked with imported goods in high demand: tape recorders, televisions, radios, furs, shoes, clothes... The store's annual sales exceeded 100,000 rubles.

During interrogations the store manager testified that from the day it opened she catered solely for the minister's family and relatives. As a rule goods for the store were selected at Raznoeksport by Shchelokov's wife, daughter-in-law, and daughter. After that they were immediately delivered to the store.

Raznoeksport employees testified that the august minister's wife, his spy daughter-in-law Nonna and daughter Irina visited warehouses, where they carefully selected the best samples from leading foreign makers, moreover, in considerable quantities.

The mysterious store was located in the cozy premises of the dacha service. Only a restricted circle of trusted people knew of its existence. V. Kalinin, former chief of the MVD's Administrative Services Department (currently under a court sentence) testified that when Shchelokov's daughter-in-law travelled on vacation to Pitsunda she would take large quantities of consumer goods (for sale, he assumed).

The case contains an exchange of business letters between the Daimler-Benz company and the Soviet Ministries of Internal Affairs and Foreign Trade according to which an understanding was reached in 1975-1977 whereby the company made the Ministry of Internal Affairs a gift of three Mercedes cars, including two equipped with traffic control instruments. It is apparent from the correspondence that the cars were intended to "ensure traffic safety during the 1980 Olympic Games" and to examine the possibility of purchasing other cars of this model. On 20 June 1975, the MVD officially notified the company that it had received the first delivery of a Mercedes-Benz 280E. It was never used by the ministry, but on 15 March 1976 it was quietly registered by Moscow's Kiev Rayon traffic police as belonging to Shchelokov himself.

In 1978, the company delivered two more Mercedes cars (models 280 and 450e) with no payment. One was registered with the traffic police in the name of I. N.



Shchelokova, the minister's daughter. Instead of the second car Shchelokov received a car of another make which was registered by the traffic police in 1980 in the name of his son Igor.

In 1977, that same Kiev Rayon GAI registered a powerful BMW Z.O.S. car as the property of the minister's wife. As justification of the right to own this car Shchelokov submitted a letter to the Council of Ministers explaining that the Ivka company had offered the car, which had been on display at the Avtoservis-73 show, as a gift.

During a search at the dacha of Igor Shchelokov a BMW motorcycle was found and confiscated. The modest research worker explained that the manufacturer had presented the motorcycle to his father at some exhibition.

Shchelokov's career was indeed distinguished by touching concern for his next of kin. More than half of a consignment of imported cars once received by the ministry wound up in the possession of members of the minister's family.

The state was able to recoup more than half a million rubles from Shchelokov "inheritance."

Item: "N. A. Shchelokov committed suicide 13 December 1984. In view of this, by an injunction dated 25 November 1987, in accordance with Art. 5, Para. 8 of the Criminal Procedural Code of the RSFSR, the criminal case against him has been closed.

"That winter morning the ex-minister received a call from the awards department of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet requesting him to return his medals. He asked the callers to come at 3:00 p.m. He put on his dress uniform. (Shchelokov had been stripped of his rank of general of the army and expelled from the Communist Party in November 1984.) Two hours before the appointed time he shot himself in the head with a hunting carbine...

Who knows how he would have behaved after his inevitable arrest? Though... why inevitable? The man in power at the time was K.U. Chernenko, with whom true-blue Brezhnevite Shchelokov had worked hand-in-glove back in Moldavia. Which way would the wind have blown?

I am sure that one day the archives will be thrown open and we will, of course, get to know the details of the criminal aspect of our recent history. We will also learn the content of Shchelokov's suicide note and hear it commented.

I repeat: Many recall that Shchelokov was not an untalented man. But the trouble with people close in spirit to the tragically deceased Shchelokovs is that they were brought up as dogmatists and then—or rather simultaneously—became cynics. After all, they themselves methodically, from Mercedes to Mercedes, staked out the invisible path that led to the suicidal finale.

**Democratic Union Said To Advocate 'Liquidation of USSR'**

18000297a Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 9 Dec 88 p 3

[Article by N. Korsakov: "The Right to Stay Away From Debate"]

[Text] Tomorrow marks forty years since the UN General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The world community has for many years focused on the human rights issue, analyzing how they are interpreted constitutionally, and implemented practically in different countries. Unfortunately, human rights are not universally exercised everywhere, with the reasons why they are limited differing from country to country. Therefore, it is natural for nations to seek to reduce these restrictions to the minimum.

A debate devoted to the International Human Rights Day is scheduled to take place on December 10th at 3:00 pm at three cultural centers in Leningrad: for railway workers, for seamen, and at the Ilich cultural center. All the participants will be able to become acquainted with the opposing or similar viewpoints, and to take the floor themselves to move the proposals on how to expand the rights we all enjoy, if they do not think that these rights are extensive enough.

The leaders of the Democratic Union (DU) and other self-styled "independent organizations" are also planning to mark International Human Rights Day by holding an eight-hour rally. Two weeks ago, the organizing committee requested the Leningrad Soviet to allow it to hold a rally "at the Winter stadium, or at the Yubileyniy Palace of Sports, or at any other civic hall seating not less than 5,000 people". The organizers intend to discuss human rights in the USSR for eight hours straight—the length of a regular work day.

The request was signed by the representatives of the Democratic Union on behalf of the organizing committee. Our newspaper has already unveiled the political thrust of the DU. Its appeals sometimes fall on the receptive ears of the members of some unofficial organizations, people who fail to see through the DU's real message.

How does the Democratic Union interpret human rights and the main right—the right to freedom? "Freedom is the right to be against", says the DU's declaration. But how about the right to be in favor of something? I think that the right of choice has always been regarded as freedom, with the proviso that freedom is unfailingly accompanied by obligations, and rights cannot exist without responsibilities. Anyone can make a wrong choice, but he or she should be prepared to face the consequences. Only then can this be called real freedom. To quote Frederick Engels, "freedom is the cognized necessity".

The pluralism which the Democratic Union leaders advocate so vociferously entails different opinions, even entirely opposite. But it does not embrace calls to overthrow the opponents, which is what the Union is actually doing. By demanding tolerance towards itself, its members come out without any qualms against "the communist regime". The DU program opens with an epigraph from Voltaire: "Your opinion is profoundly inimical to me, but I am prepared to sacrifice my life to defend your right to express it." But don't be deluded. DU members would not give up their lives for our sake. They expect us to make such a sacrifice.

On sizing up the DU program, declaration and statutes, a group of lawyers from Leningrad University arrived at the conclusion that the Union intends "to abolish the Soviet Union and to create an autonomy-based state, which runs counter to Soviet laws. According to the present legislation, the attempt to set up an organization to change the existing social and state system is considered high treason. Such conspiracy is characterized by the goal of changing the existing Soviet state and social system." The DU documents say that its purpose is not to modify the social system but to overhaul it completely, which means to replace it. The only conclusion one can draw from these statements is that an organization pursuing these goals is anti-Soviet and its existence runs counter to the Soviet constitution and laws. The rally speakers are going to rehash the familiar cliches about how Vladimir Ulyanov (Lenin) usurped power in 1917, how the Communists have abolished all democratic freedoms, establishing a fascist and totalitarian communist regime in the USSR. In her letter to our paper, N. V. Dybovskaya, M.A. (Law), wrote that the Democratic Union denies the leading role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The DU calls for establishing a multi-party system, rejects Leninism, which its leaders interpret as a Stalinist regime, she says. All other demands made by the DU have either been included in the CPSU documents or come across as perplexingly naive and off the mark. The DU platform does not contain a single constructive shred.

One can hardly disagree with her opinion, because the DU's verbose and emotion-loaded declaration, program and statutes are just a hodge podge of the most burning and controversial issues. They lack scientific content, and they based on no scholarly research, theories or historical experience. In other words, they contain no points for an analysis or a discussion. That is why it makes no sense to debate "the opposition" openly. What is there to debate if there is no debating issue? And why should we give the floor to well established opponents of the Soviet state?

The Lengorispolkom's denial of permission to hold the rally is well grounded, because the Soviet laws ban anti-state and anti-Soviet propaganda. Had the Ispolkom granted it, it would have violated the Soviet laws.

But paying lip service to the state based on the rule of law, the DU leaders stubbornly refuse to abide by the laws of the state in which they live. So they are planning to hold the rally regardless of the ban. To what purpose? Again, N.V. Dybovskaia lays it bare in the same letter. "The leaders of the Democratic Union capitalize politically by taking part in civil disobedience campaigns, by openly challenging the authorities, compelling militia workers to use force against them", she says. One can often hear that although the DU has no platform and its approach is unprofessional, its members suffer a lot because of their convictions. We used to know people who became martyrs upholding a cause, but here we deal with those suffering from the lack of causes. Lacking a political culture and convincing arguments to conduct political discussion, the opposition is trying to gain ground by challenging the ban on its rallies, defying the authorities, firing up the public with irresponsible statements. The total number of days under arrest or the amount of fines paid for acts of civil disobedience have become its most important political trump card. The opposition seeks to provoke a debate and to tie down the most influential and powerful advocates of perestroika with a discussion of the absurd demands made by the DU and their ilk. Should we oblige them?

I do not think we should, because unity and mutual understanding, our joint efforts to renovate our society, are required today more than ever before.

#### **1989 Census Aims at Clarifying Nationalities Statistics**

18300222 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian  
24 Dec 88 p 2

[Interview by Lt Col V. Kosarev with Doctor of Geographical Sciences, Professor S. Bruk, under the "Interview on the Eve of the Event" rubric: "How Many of Us Are There, and Who Are We?"]

[Text] Preparations are being completed for the All-Union Census, and the day that it will begin—12 February—is fast approaching. It is hard to overestimate the importance of the census. Complete and reliable information on the population derived in the course of the census will become the data base for planning the social and economic development of the state, and for the administration of all spheres of life of the society.

How accurately does the census taking place in the country reflect the demographic processes which, as is well-known, closely interact with the socio-economic and the national processes? Our correspondent asked Professor S. Bruk, doctor of geographic sciences and the chief scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences Ethnography Institute, to talk about this.

[Kosarev] Among the questions which in the course of the census will be asked of every person, there are also questions associated with defining one's nationality and native language. People answered these questions during

the preceding census as well. And nevertheless, when we speak about how many nations and nationalities live in our country, we end up with a highly inexact formulation: "Over 100." What is the problem here? Can the census truly not provide a more accurate answer?

[Bruk] The questions on nationality, native language and the ability to speak with complete confidence the language of another nation of the USSR, listed on the census form, are very important. The data received from analysis of the responses to them will help not only determining just how many people belong to this or that nationality. They will to a significant extent assist in restoring the culture of the small nations. Without these data it would be impossible to determine, for example, how many schools, textbooks, and teachers we need; or how much literature to produce in this or that language; or to receive answers to other questions associated with the development of culture and education.

Actually, all the official documents report year in, year out, that over 100 nations and nationalities live and work in our land. At the very same time, linguistic calculations bear witness that more than 180 languages are used in everyday life in the USSR. How can one explain such a discrepancy? After all, as a rule every nation speaks its own language, and so both figures should be about the same.

During the 1926 census, when we managed to apply fairly consistently the principle of individual self-definition with respect to nationality, over 150 nations and nationalities were identified in the country; but in 1959 only 109 were identified; while in the course of the last census there were 101. What happened to cause more than four dozen nationalities to disappear? This question cannot but disturb us, the scientists. And it disturbs the public as well.

In the 1930's a concerted blending of closely-related, territorial, tribal and other small groups into larger nations and nationalities took place. Small multi-national groups for entirely natural reasons became absorbed by larger and more developed ethnic groups. This took place most intensively in the previously backward regions of Siberia, Kazakhstan and Central Asia. But after the Great Patriotic War the processes of unifying ethnic groups stabilized noticeably.

There is also another no-less-important reason for the decline of the number of nations and nationalities in the statistical data. As is well-known, in 1932 the passport system was introduced for a significant portion of the populace, and a little later, for all citizens of the country. The first time the passports were issued one was permitted free choice of nationality. By the end of the 1930's it had been determined that when listing their nationality, children must indicate one of the nationalities of their parents. In spite of the fact that nationality was recorded in the course of the census, as a rule it was done on the basis of self-definition, by the person being questioned.



And although passport data was not taken into consideration, the influence of that document was significant. This made it difficult to gather reliable data about the ethnic processes going on in the country. There were instances in which, by arbitrary decision of the local organs, certain nationalities "disappeared" or were reckoned part of the basic nationality of the republic—for example, the Talysh people in Azerbaijan SSR.

[Kosarev] What is being done to ensure that this is not repeated in the course of the current census, and that reliable data are received?

[Bruck] A great deal of work has been carried out, and I am convinced that in terms of the level of preparation, the coming census will be incomparably better than all previous ones. I refer chiefly to the fact that during the preparation process, a new dictionary of nationalities and languages of the USSR was compiled. It will be of invaluable assistance in processing the results of the census—although the census-takers will be writing down only those answers which the people questioned provide.

In addition, the basic list of nationalities to be processed has been significantly expanded: it includes 128 designations. Moreover, there is another list which includes the names of more than 120 nations, of which there are small groups living in the USSR.

I cannot fail to mention another problem. Until the present time we had not always been able to define what is a nation and what is a part of a nation (an ethnographical group). There is, unfortunately, no precise definition. One would think that the results of the census will help the scientists find the answer to this question.

There is still another significant aspect. Whereas in the past the census-takers would quite often write down data from the passport or would prompt the person being questioned with respect to nationality, this is now categorically forbidden. There shall be no pressure and no prompting whatsoever. I emphasize once again that the census sheet will record only that which the person questioned supplies, even if this information does not correspond with that on the passport. This is stipulated in the instructions for conducting the census. It is also very important, that all non-processed materials from the census will be published.

[Kosarev] Nevertheless, let's just suppose that suddenly groups appear which had not been considered in the preliminary listings of nationalities and languages.

[Bruck] That situation has been anticipated. And in this case additional processing will be carried out. In terms of receiving factual and complete information, a great deal will depend on how well they are prepared for conducting the census in the localities. Previously, because of incorrect conceptions on the processes of natural assimilation, the census organizers would frequently fail to consider the presence of comparatively small nations,

which still had their own native language—which, by the way, also explains the fact that the number of languages in the country exceeds the number of nations, according to the statistical data. These mistakes must not be allowed to recur.

Conscientious and intelligent conduct of the All-Union Popular Census will permit us to answer many questions which are vitally important to the country.

#### **Split at Estonian Labor Collectives Conference Described**

18000331 Tallinn SOVetskaya ESTONIYA  
in Russian 2 Dec 88 p 3

[Article by Special Correspondents V. Ivanov and A. Podvezko: "Labor Collectives—Aspects of the Problem: One More Concrete Step"]

[Text] One more concrete step was taken on the path to consolidate the republic's entire progressive community on 30 November at the constituent conference of the United Council of Labor Collectives. Yes, that is what this organ is called today, the OSTK [United Council of Labor Collectives]. Until now (even in our newspaper's report yesterday) it was called the OSPK—United Council of Production Collectives. But at the suggestion of the delegation from Narva and certain other participants in the conference, it was decided to henceforth use the word "labor" collectives. This is not a formalistic replacement of one word with another; it is fundamental—this approach allows not only large industrial enterprises to join the movement, but also labor collectives engaged in the nonproduction sphere.

This should be qualified immediately: this conference was held simultaneously in two places, the House of Political Education (as was announced in advance) and the City Hall. The reason it turned out that way is a subject for special discussion. Let us hear from Vladimir Yarovoy, director of the USSR Dvigatel Plant and chairman of the organizing committee of the OSPK, who was elected chairman of the OSTK presidium at the conference:

"Last evening we found out that the Popular Front was taking very definite steps to prevent our conference from being held."

(From the editors: For example, on 29 November representatives of the Marata Popular Front of Estonia [NFE] over plant radio invited all who wanted to, to take part in picketing the House of Political Education building before and after the conference, that is, from 1400 to 1800 hours. The rayon newspaper KHARYU ELU suggested to rural rayons, also on the eve of the conference, that each one send 10 people to take part. But then on 29 November the republic newspapers published the appeal of the directors of primarily local and light industry to

the managers of Estonia's enterprises, institutions, organizations, and farms to join together to realize the IME program. To do this the appeal proposed that they call **their own** conference.)

"Another variant was to move our event to a later date and meanwhile hold a republic trade union conference at which all the questions which we had indicated in the drafts of our program and by-laws would be studied. That is, to take the initiative away from us, so to speak. But inasmuch as there was very little time left to make preparations for a trade union conference, another path was chosen.

"We prepared and sent a written announcement to Comrade Sillari, first secretary of the Tallinn Party Gorkom and Comrade Ganyushov, secretary of the Estonian CP Central Committee, saying that if any obstacles arose before our delegates when they were coming into the building, we would put the responsibility for the complications which might arise wholly on those who organized those obstacles. That is, essentially, the Popular Front.

"An understanding was reached that the directors of enterprises belonging to the OSTK organizing committee would meet with the directors of republic light and local industry enterprises in order to come to a mutually acceptable solution together. The first such meeting was held at 2100 hours on 29 November. Until 2330 hours they discussed the proposal to not hold our conference at all at this time. The reason was that many enterprises and even agricultural collectives had expressed a desire to participate, but only a little time was left and it would have been necessary to prepare from the beginning. And it was also too late to change our plans. Then a compromise was suggested, that everyone together go to the City Hall and there discuss the draft documents we had brought for adoption.

"The three of us (in addition to me Talip Becnazarov, director of the Pykhyala Plant, and Sergey Pasko, a member of our organizing committee) did not have the authority to accept or reject such a proposal. The second round of negotiations began. At 0100 hours we gathered again, after consulting with colleagues from OSPK. And only in the third phase, when it was already 0500 hours, did a version that suited all sides emerge: we would assemble **in parallel** in two places and discuss our drafts. At the same time we agreed that the subject of discussion would remain **chiefly** economic and social issues, that we would avoid superfluous politization and ideologization of the subject. Then we were to move to the City Hall and there, together work out the final version of the by-laws and program of the future organization and adopt them. Unfortunately, however, we were not able to wholly fulfill this condition. Did you hear the statement by Vladimir Yanchenko, director of the polytekhnikum and representative from Kokhtal-Yarvey? Yes, in my opinion he put too much emphasis on precisely the political aspects. I am far from agreeing with everything

he said, but I do not censure him for that. The fact was that when the Kokhtla-Yarve delegation, as agreed, arrived at the House of Political Education at 0200 hours they were unable to get inside because of pickets who blocked their way. It was necessary to bring 130 people in through the back door, which wasted time, for both me and other members of the organizing committee, incidentally. How can I, after such a "warm" welcome, persuade people to be calm and restrained? Incidentally, in the morning round of talks with the directors from light and local industry they promised that there would not be any pickets. But this promise was not entirely carried out: it was not until after 0300 hours that the pickets finally left."

Let us draw back from this quotation of our talk with V. Yarovoy for a minute. Let us think about this. Reports of the intentions of a group of managers of USSR and USSR-republic enterprises (let us note specially that **they were empowered by the councils of the labor collectives**) to establish a united council, the OSPK, had been published in the republic press for several months. At first it was spoken of simply as an idea of consolidating the labor collectives, but then followed specific talk about the form of such a consolidation. In other words, there had been talk about the OSPK for at least several weeks. And during this it was stressed that one of the program goals was to implement the idea of republic cost accounting. This organization was originally open for participation by all who wanted to. But just in the last stage **several hundred** enterprises and organizations **at once** expressed the intention to join the new movement.

Where did all this activism come from so suddenly?

We are not drawing any definite conclusions, for by itself the decision of other collectives to join together to work more effectively for the good of the republic and all its inhabitants is unquestionably a useful initiative. But the coincidence of dates and a certain haste observed here cannot help but lead up to certain thoughts.

Meanwhile events developed on their own. At the start of the meeting in the City Hall L. Noormets, director of the Kooperator Production Association, and Yu. Nugis, director of the Estoplast Plant, told the delegates about the agreement reached the night before with the organizers of the OSTK conference and asked them not to make hurried decisions, to take the position of the other meeting into account. They observed that it was not necessary to assume that a common language could not be found with the USSR enterprises; a position acceptable to all needed to be found.

Then E. Savisaar stated a different opinion. He suggested that the delegates disregard what the OSTK conference would or would not accept. We must set up our own organizations and adopt one of the by-law drafts (there

were two) and resolutions submitted by those in attendance. He also called on the delegates to consider the amendments to the ESSR Constitution effective and to defend this opinion.

But the representatives of the labor collectives, after consulting in their delegations, decided to wait to see how the conference in the House of Political Education ended, and make their decision depending on this. Two empty sections with 800 chairs, which were left for the "other side," eloquently testified to their intentions.

As we see, there was a desire to find agreement on both sides. But it "broke down" at a certain stage. So soon after the fact it is difficult to say exactly when the moment occurred after which the discussion in the different halls took different directions. But it would seem to make sense, after passions die down, to carefully, step by step, track down where this unfortunate mistake was made. In any case, the meetings came to diametrically opposed decisions in some matters.

At No 12 Lenin Boulevard (the address of the new House of Political Education) it was announced that the United Council of Labor Collectives of the Estonian SSR had been formed and adopted, with amendments and additions, its by-laws and also a program (it is true that the program was taken "as a foundation" and the council of chairmen was commissioned to polish the text taking into considering the suggestions received from delegates during the discussion). We must stipulate that this formally violated the agreement reached during the nighttime talks, when it was decided that neither draft would be finally instituted, but only adopted as a foundation for later, joint polishing.

As soon as this outcome of the discussions became known in the City Hall, they immediately voted, by an arithmetical majority of votes (there too 2,722 mandates were given to representatives of 736 enterprises) against the draft of the by-laws that was adopted at No 12 Lenin Boulevard. And on this basis they decreed: consider the decision to form the OSTK ineffective, that both meetings were nothing but geographic "points" of the same general group. Then they formed their own organization, calling it the Union of Labor Collectives of Estonia.

Let us once again go into the "mechanics." There were deviations by both sides from the agreement reached earlier. Logically, by "rewinding" the film of events, it is probably possible to establish exactly who made the first false step here, and where it was made. Such an "investigation," however instructive in itself, has no constructive value. It is more important to understand this: in principle, how did such a starkly manifested mutual misunderstanding become possible?

Without claiming to have the final truth, let us try all the same to answer this question.

It happened that the idea of forming the OSPK (or OSTK in its new version) was not objectively reflected in the republic's mass media at first. We do not deny our share of responsibility for this; our newspaper probably could have, and should have, made greater efforts to "dig up" and pass on this information.

In any case, by 30 November the deed was done: the OSPK had been given the "image of the enemy." We began to hear phrases such as (using only the mildest ones) "a new Industrial Party," "colonial domination by the central departments," and much more. And in the present situation, when relations in the republic are quite strained, it did not take much.

And when it was reliably established later that "the devil was not as bad as he had been painted to be," the report of a mutually acceptable decision adopted at the meeting with then-secretary of the Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party I. Toome did not have much impact and fell on unfavorable soil: rumors about a "conspiracy of the directors of USSR enterprises had spread too widely and put down strong roots. Their consequences showed graphically in the interviews which we conducted with several participants in the conference. And they are people who were initially fairly neutral to the idea of the OSPK. We will familiarize you with them a little later.

So the stereotype of suspicion came into play, where people were inclined in advance to see each upcoming step by the "other side" as containing an "evil intent," a "dirty trick," or a desire—to use non-parliamentary language—to outsmart them.

We will not undertake to say that no points in the OSTK's draft by-laws and program contain errors or need refinement. Just as, incidentally, it is apparent that the critical remarks on their content by the opponents are not without grounds. (The members of the organizing committee themselves, in fact, consistently stressed that they were open to criticism, if only it was constructive).

So at a certain stage the two sides lacked the manners, restraint, good will, and—finally—wisdom to overcome the stereotype of rejecting a different opinion. Here too you can talk about a greater or lesser degree of restraint, but nonetheless, beyond a certain point both sides objectively bear responsibility.

But let us listen to what the participants at the conference discussed. There would certainly be no reason to retell the content of all the statements, because they were relayed in Russian over Estonian Radio (on the UHF band), and it would not be possible to present a discussion which lasted a total of about 7 hours, not counting breaks. Therefore we will limit ourselves to two interviews with guests (an objective "view from outside") and excerpts from several statements made on the podium at the conference.



**Myart Myagi, second secretary of the Yygevaskiy Raykom of the Communist Party of Estonia: "Do We Perhaps Need an 'Anti-Trust Law'?"**

"First, my general impressions of the conference, to which I was invited as an observer. There were many constructive and useful things in the statements. But the organizers are probably not interested in just positive opinions (and, anyway, there were plenty of them). So now, in my opinion, with all its pluses, the new movement conceals a serious danger too, or in any case a hint of danger. I mean a suspicious similarity, in form, between the united council being set up and the monopolies and concerns that exist in the West. In any case there are outward features of similarity: concentration of enormous amounts of money and labor and material resources, which are supposed to be spent for construction of housing, schools, nursery schools, sports facilities, and so, in essentially the same hands. But then what is the role of the soviets, when today we talk from every podium of giving them full power? And what I am saying applies not only to the OSTK; the same danger is hidden in the association of enterprises and light and local industry."

Incidentally, a partial answer to M. Myagi's words was given at the press conference of the just-elected OSTK presidium by Igor Shepelevich, a member of the presidium and director of the ETZ imeni Kh. Pegelman:

"We want to emphasize that we are not forming a trust or a concern, but a fairly free association of independent collectives, and in the period between conferences its united council and presidium will only coordinate general efforts to solve the economic, personnel, and social problems of our regions."

**Mikhail Bronshteyn, Academician of the ESSR Academy of Sciences: "Understand Each Other's Problems Better"**

"I did not have an opportunity to become familiar with the materials of the OSPK, or OSTK in the new form, earlier. Therefore I am judging only by what I see and hear. To be honest, based on the fragmentary 'data' that had reached me I had a guarded, to put it mildly, attitude. But what is taking place here inspires me with optimism, although not unqualified. Especially after the decisions of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet which annulled several points adopted at the extraordinary session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet on 16 November. It seemed to me that some people were trying to use the situation—let us be frank—to gloat over the misfortunes of others. But the organizing committee was able to keep the discussion from being led off the subject for which this conference was called."

(From the editors: It cannot be said that there were no such attempts at all. The presidium of the conference received a note from the hall in which the author suggested that a telegram be sent on behalf of those assembled in the House of Political Education to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet supporting its

decision on the amendments to the ESSR Constitution and other documents from the 16 November session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet. But the newly elected presidium of the OSPK decided not to send such a telegram in order to avoid possible complications. Representatives of the OSTK presidium informed the editors of the newspapers RAKHVA KHYAEL and SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA of their decision after the press conference.)

"There is a great deal of common sense in the economic part of the program proposed by the organizing committee," M. Bronshteyn continues. "I mean specialization within the republic, cooperative development, mutual aid and reorientation of industry, and a transition to modern methods of economic activity and thinking. Especially because it is truly difficult for USSR-subordinate enterprises to find their own place in a republic system of cost accounting. Joining and coordinating efforts will allow them to represent the interests of the republic more effectively in the USSR-wide market too (for to demand from these large enterprises that they work only for internal republic needs is simply irrational; it is firing a cannon at a fly). Let them pay taxes to the republic budget, and let them take part in regional programs. Let them participate actively and effectively in environmental protection, and at the same time operate on the USSR and international markets. It will be mutually beneficial, or more accurately it is for the common good. And the form of the OSTK enlarges this potential."

"There are moments of politicization here and miscues on occasion by state organs, but it is my impression that they are not deliberate; rather they are more likely poorly thought-out and quite clearly worded statements that allow two interpretations."

We asked if there are possibly people who want to and are able to "latch onto" these statements and use them to stir up the situation.

"All this is a result of not understanding one another. On both sides. I have always said and will continue to say that the Russian-language population should have a deeper understanding of the problems of the Estonian population, and understanding of the sources and consequences of the Estonians' concern for their land, language, culture, economy, and natural world. They should be filled with these concerns. There does not have to be love, that is personal for each one of us. But it is vitally necessary to remove the lack of understanding. At the same time, however, it is impossible to ignore another reality: 40 percent of the inhabitants of Estonia are Russian speakers. They have their own interests. And any attempt to press them in any way, to put them in an unequal status—whether by economic, political, or linguistic methods—cannot be recognized as democratic. Democracy is the equality of all citizens before the law. Equal rights regardless of nationality, language, and the rest; the right to labor, education, housing, and so on."

That is why I do not like the part on language in the draft law. I am not at all opposed to Estonian being the state language. But I do not like the attempts to move away from talk about the state level of the guarantees of the use and development of the Russian language as the language of interethnic communication.

"I want to stress once more. The desire to understand one another must be mutual. It is not such a difficult alphabet, but no one will master it this way."

**Viktor Vakhta, secretary of the Presidium of the ESSR Supreme Soviet (from his statement): "The Foundation of Foundations of the Socialist State"**

"The labor collective has been given the constitutional right to take part in discussing and deciding state matters. It is the labor collectives to which the Constitution assigns the fundamentally important tasks of indoctrinating their members in a spirit of communist morality and raising their political consciousness, culture, and vocational qualifications. Based on this, all possible reliance on labor collectives in deciding any state matters should be generally recognized and become an element of everyday practice. This is especially important now, when restructuring is underway. United in a single cause and striving for a single goal, the labor collectives are the foundation of foundations of our socialist state, the irreplaceable engine of economic development of the republic and of the country.

"Our country today has adopted and is applying the Law on the Labor Collective and the Law on the State Enterprise, in which the role of labor collectives in deciding pressing problems of society is reinforced and developed applicable to current conditions.

"Thus, the councils of labor collectives are formed on the basis of the law and were formed in the period of restructuring and to promote restructuring. I think that their existence and development must be supported. And there are no grounds to doubt the competence of the unified efforts of the councils of labor collectives to exercise their lawful rights and duties, foremost among which is improving production activity. But if something or someone obstructs them in this, then the labor collectives represented by their councils not only can but are obligated to act as fully empowered elements of the political system of the socialist state."

This is probably the time to return to the title of this report. So, has a step toward consolidation been taken? At first glance the answer is plainly negative: what kind of consolidation is it where there has been a clear demarcation?

But let us not be too quick to draw conclusions based on just the "obvious." In the first place, the palette of public life in the republic has been enriched by two new

movements, which by itself is a positive fact. The broader the spectrum of opinions and points of view, the more objective the total picture will be.

In the second place, the path to a goal does not have to be straight as an arrow, on a single plane. We are talking about relations among people, and their sometimes conflicting interests. In this you cannot avoid multidimensional space. Two new associations have been formed and they have fundamentally common goals: raising our standard of living in all its aspects. And what can prevent them in the future from cooperating, when the new wave of emotions recedes and both sides become convinced in reality that they are in many respects following similar paths? To put it more simply, when we all finally move from words to deeds. Especially because, as Nikolay Ganyushov, secretary of the Estonian CP Central Committee said in his speech at the conference in the House of Political Education, an unstable moral atmosphere in the republic has already led to a situation where labor productivity and other production indicators at industrial enterprises have started to decline. Will we perhaps give this serious thought?

#### **Heads of Rival Estonian Labor Collectives Groups Interviewed**

18000374 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA  
in Russian 16 Dec 88 p 1

[Interview with Yulo Nugis, director general of the "Estoplast" production complex and chairman of the Estonian Union of Labor Collectives, and Vladimir Yarovoy, chairman of the EsSSR Joint Council of Labor Collectives and director of the centrally managed "Dvigatel" plant, with correspondent V. Ivanov: "Still, a Step To Consolidation"]

[Text] Today we publish the documents of the conference of the EsSSR Joint Council of Labor Collectives which took place on November 30. There does not seem to be any need to supplement them with a detailed commentary: a well-informed reader would know what they mean. Nevertheless, some relevant points which, as filmmakers say, were outside the frame should be mentioned separately and discussed clearly and directly enough so as not to be misinterpreted in the future. This primarily refers to a view that has gained currency after November 30 and is presently shared by a rather large group of people: namely, that the republic's workers have split along the nationality lines, exacerbating the already tense situation.

Is it true? This question was at the heart of our correspondent's discussion with the leaders of the two new organizations: Yulo Nugis, director general of the "Estoplast" production complex and chairman of the Estonian Union of Labor Collectives, and Vladimir Yarovoy, chairman of the EsSSR Joint Council of Labor Collectives (JCLC) and director of the centrally managed "Dvigatel" plant.

[V. Ivanov] To begin with, do you think that the situation that has led to two independent but essentially similar organizations being created should in and of itself give rise to hopeless dejection and to the talk of the republic's population being irreversibly split?

[V. Yarovoy] I do not see a tragedy here, even though there is no reason for blind optimism either, especially if we recall the methods used by certain elements before and during the founding conference of the JCLC. While I do not have any complaints against the organizers and leaders of the part of the conference that was held at the City Hall, and understand fully well that the leadership of the Estonian Popular Front (EPF) as a whole should not be held responsible for the actions of some of its active members, I nevertheless would like to stress that those actions (in particular, picketing of the House of Political Education building before the start of the conference, preliminary "work" done at some enterprises and other similar actions) greatly influenced—directly or not—the outcome.

But this is an aside. In general, speaking of the current situation, the existence of two related, or at least similar, public organizations does not in and of itself bear the seeds of discord. In the final analysis, we have common aims, which are to raise the living standard of the population and to lay the material foundation for prosperity in the republic. Here, a kind of competitive spirit may even arise between us: who could solve the problem better.

But let me repeat that this would only be possible if no artificial negative emotions were forced on the JCLC and on the Union of Labor Collectives, which would turn the public opinion negative.

[Yu. Nugis] I think that what happened was in a large measure determined by objective causes. First, many people have been involved in developing IME [expansion unknown, Estonian term spelled in Latin characters] (or republic-wide self-financing, as others call it, but the name does not matter), but not those who would have to carry it out in practice, not labor collectives and business managers. Once these latter began to look at IME, the differences in approach inevitably surfaced. In part, the lack of coordination between different departments is to blame, and in part the old thinking patterns are. We could spend a long time discussing whether it is good or bad, but the fact remains.

And another point. The Russian-speaking population of the republic, once again due to objective causes, needed an organization to represent, and if need be protect, their interests. Here, once again, we could engage in a very detailed analysis why it happened this way and who is to blame, and weigh various buts and ifs (which is what we are in effect doing, without much to show for it), but the fact once again remains and to close one's eyes to reality would not be smart, to say the least. That role has been assumed by the JCLC, which began as the Joint Council

of Professional (?) Collectives. (The interested but not well-informed reader can look up the difference in the December 2 issue of our newspaper—V.Ivanov)

I do not want to sound like some utterly calm Olympian who is in a detached manner surveying the events from above the clouds and commenting on them dispassionately. There are many things I do not like in the existing situation. My main problem with the JCLC is that its papers reveal an attempt to subordinate the human being to industrial relations, and not the other way around which would, in our view, serve today's economic goals better. On the other hand, I do not claim to possess the absolute truth and would only be too glad if life proved my impressions wrong.

[V. Ivanov] During the conference, and actually before and after it, some people expressed concern that by uniting various enterprises and their labor collectives we would create a monopoly in the political and social spheres and that power could then be shifted to technocrats. This criticism concerns the JCLC and the Union of Labor Collectives in equal measure. What do you think of it?

[V. Yarovoy] A casual onlooker who does not see deeply could perhaps perceive this danger. But believe me, the directors' plot exists only in the minds of those who talk of it ceaselessly. Economic managers do not want political power. They do not aspire to manage everything and everybody... As it is, lately we have been engaged in alien pursuits, attending rallies and sitting on various noneconomic committees beyond all measure, while our businesses have been idle...

True, I have heard that from now on monopolies represented by directors of enterprises and complexes would have a final say over what is being built and where, and what projects to deny funding to altogether... But the idea is that we (I mean enterprises in general) will merely be disbursing funds and resources for construction, and will have to clear the size of all projects, construction schedules, whether or not a project is appropriate for a given location and other questions with local soviets of the people's deputies. Thus, there can be no question of supplanting the soviet power.

Many people probably have read the recent interview with Tallinn party gorkom secretary E.A.Sillari in the newspaper YKHTULEKHT-VECHERNIY TALLINN where he, among other things, listed actual construction projects that would be undertaken in the republic's capital with the participation of the "Dvigatel" plant. All the data came from the joint agreement signed by the city's mayor Kh.Lumi, E.A.Sillari and myself. Yet, now the schedules originally set in that agreement have been greatly condensed. To meet the new deadlines, we will have to request the help of our colleagues in the JCLC. Only then could we do the work on time, I think. But even here, there are some impediments. The very same evening paper published an article in October titled



"The Lasnamyae Slope: Will It Belong to the City or to an Organization", which proposed not to lease the slope of Mount Lasnamyae to "Dvigatel". What was the argument about, anyway? Of course it should belong to the city. After all, is our plant not part of the city, too?

[Yu. Nugis] In my opinion, power must be kept away from technocrats. Power is the business of politicians, political scientists and humanities scholars. In general, everyone should stick to his own work. In this respect—and please do not focus special attention on this sentence—the JCLC and our Union could act as a check on one another by making sure that the competitor does not get carried away by political activities. Still, we probably will not be able to steer clear of all politics, since ideological problems, too, are decided in labor collectives. So it is important not to cross the line beyond which political adventures begins.

In this respect, I want to stress that our Union is in no way affiliated with the EPF. We may, to a greater or lesser degree, sympathize with its program and activities in general (or not sympathize, as the case may be; it is up to each individual) and we may employ specialists, such as sociologists, economists and psychologists, who are active members of the EPF. Yet, we by no means coordinate our actions with the leadership or the council of representatives of the EPF. Our functions are different. We reserve our freedom to act and to criticize the position of various EPF leaders.

[V. Ivanov] At various levels, we increasingly hear appeals not to accentuate the differences among various movements and organizations but to seek common ground and focus in their work on those tangent points, while working out their differences in the course of collaboration. From this point of view, what do you see in the future for the JCLC and the Union of Labor Collectives?

[V. Yarovoy] I think that on our side one of the first steps toward rapprochement has been the establishment of prizes for the best books, articles and other works by creative intelligentsia promoting the consolidation of all progressive forces in the republic. This was also the aim of our appeal to all socio-political movements in Estonia to refrain from staging events that are clearly political in character. For instance, in late November and early December we met with members of the coordinating council of the Intermovement [non-Estonian independent group] and, since they could no longer cancel the rally set for December 3, asked them at least to avoid extreme emotions and ungentlemanly stabs. Unfortunately, it was not possible to avoid such excesses...

Now more about the common ground... We intend, once we have determined what exactly is needed, to propose to our colleagues in the Union of Labor Collectives to do joint repair work in clinics, pre-school facilities and schools (no matter which entity they belong to, be it a

municipality or an organization, both all-union or republic-level). Currently we are investigating what kind of help Tallinn's Moskovskiy rayon needs from labor collectives. Health care and education are areas that concern everyone.

Furthermore, the republic's Gosplan has sent us a list of equipment needed by light industry and of actual goods the production of which must be increased to satisfy consumer demand. Note that I received this list not as a plant director but as a JCLC chairman.

[Yu. Nugis] The principal foundation for joint efforts is the IME system, or republic-wide self-financing. I have already mentioned that there are some differences of opinion about it. Well, we can talk about it, but not so that we could each go into his own corner afterwards, but in order to carry out the idea better in real life. The development of culture, education and the social sector is indispensable to all of us.

We could help enterprises that now report directly to central entities to be integrated into the IME system once they are transferred to the republic. For instance, our complex or some other enterprise belonging to the Union of Labor Collectives could hire, either temporarily or permanently, some of the workers who will lose their jobs when a given enterprise belonging to the JCLC changes specialization. There are many possibilities; what we need is to look into the core of the problems.

We could also share experience gained when we ourselves switched from reporting to the center ("Estoplast" used to be part of the USSR Ministry of Electrotechnical Industry) to the republican system.

In the course of the interview, the two managers said that they valued very highly the experience they gained during the nighttime negotiation session prior to the November 30 conference (See SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, December 2). Even though the agreements reached at the time were not fully implemented, the existence of the agreements themselves convincingly proves that they can be implemented in principle in the future.

Reader K.S.Kopytina from Tallinn, who sent us a letter sharing her personal impressions about the JCLC conference and events surrounding it, writes:

"I also want to express regret that the leaderships of the Intermovement and the EPF were not swayed by the appeal of the JCLC's founding conference to public organizations to refrain temporarily from staging political events, holding a rally on December 3 (in the case of the Intermovement) and picketing the session of the EsSSR Supreme Soviet on December 5 and 6 (in the case of the EPF). I hope that the coordinating council of the Intermovement and the leadership of the EPF will understand that time has come to turn away from mutual recriminations and toward discussions. There is no other way."

We wanted to conclude the report with those words, which define the meaning of the current situation most precisely.

#### **LPF Protests Distorted Description of Members' Visit to USA**

18080004 Riga PADOMJU JAUNATNE in Latvian  
16 Dec 88 p 1

[Open letter from the LPF board of directors and the TV program "Labvakar!" [Good Evening!] to CINA: "Latvian Popular Front Boards of Directors and Program's "Labvakar" Open Letter to the Newspaper CINA"]

[Text] On 15 Dec 88, CINA published an unsigned commentary under the title "From the Voice of America Broadcast", where, in our opinion, it presented a deliberately biased information about a visit to the ALA [American Latvian Association] congress in Washington, D.C. by the LPF Council's members S. Kalniete and E. Inkens. With regard to this, we state the following:

1. The LPF in its program stipulated the necessity to form constructive ties with various layers of the Latvians living abroad and to renounce the stereotype Stalinist thinking by accepting a point of view that it is possible to have discussions even with those, who express opinions unacceptable to the LPF. The LPF is reminding us that M. Gorbachev in his politics always stresses the new thinking, which is necessary in every sphere of activities. One of the new thinking features is an open dialog with all.

2. The LPF cannot be responsible for the VOA description of the ALA congress. In the same way, any reasonably thinking person understands that the participation of the above mentioned LPF Council's members in the ALA congress as GUESTS [Caps in the original] does not mean that the LPF accepts the resolutions adopted by the ALA congress.

3. The LPF considers CINA's article, which is based on the presence of S. Kalniete and E. Inkens at the ALA congress, to be a deliberate attempt to create a distorted impression of the LPF as having "subversive" connections with the "reactionary wing of the Latvian emigration". The commentary is written in the style of the infamous "witch hunt" times, which indicates an attempt of the real perestroika's (including the relations with the Latvian emigration) opponents to compromise the LPF by accusing it in such activities and engagements, which are groundless.

The LPF Council categorically rejects CINA's insults and attacks on the LPF as well as the accusatory tone of the commentary as though it is demanding the LPF to justify its conduct.

The LPF is confident that a broad dialog with the fellow-countrymen living abroad conforms to the ideas of perestroika and glasnost and to the guidelines of the 19th

CPSU conference, and serves the qualitative changes in the economic, social, and cultural life of the LaSSR. A deliberate distortion of these attempts is serving the purposes of perestroika's opponents.

#### **Interfront Draft Statutes Published**

18000308a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
2 Dec 88 p 3

[Unattributed text "Draft Statutes of the Latvian SSR International Front"]

[Text] 1. The International Front of the workers of the Latvian SSR (Interfront) is a voluntary public organization set up at the initiative of the workers for the purpose of recruiting inhabitants of the republic to implement and deepen the perestroika started at the initiative and under the leadership of the CPSU.

Interfront unites within its ranks workers, peasants, the intelligentsia, youth and the non-working section of the population regardless of party membership, national or racial affiliation or religious beliefs.

2. Interfront recognizes the leading role of the CPSU in society and its operates independently and democratically in accordance with the Constitution and laws of the USSR, the Constitution and laws of the Latvian SSR and the program and statutes of Interfront, and cooperates with party, soviet and state organs, councils of labor collectives, public sociopolitical organizations and other associations having aims and tasks in common with Interfront.

3. The main aims of Interfront are as follows:

- raising the standard of living for inhabitants of the republic and protecting their social interests;
- insuring the further free development of each nation and nationality of Soviet Latvia and strengthening the friendship and equal cooperation of the peoples on the principles of internationalism;
- achieving economic independence for the Latvian SSR within the framework of the country's national economy complex;
- effective struggle against bureaucracy and manifestations of Stalinism, chauvinism and nationalism;

- developing the national self-awareness of all the peoples of Soviet Latvia taking into account enhanced political, legal, economic and ecological standards;
- perfecting socialist democracy and guaranteeing glasnost;
- safeguarding the dignity of a citizen of any nationality in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights.

4. The main forms of Interfront activity are the following:

- drawing up and submitting proposals on urgent questions of political and socioeconomic life and on draft laws and other enforceable enactments to party, public, legislative and state organs;
- submitting constructive proposals regarding draft documents submitted for national debate;
- nominating candidates and taking part in election campaigns to elect soviets at all levels;
- participating in referenda and conducting meetings, debates, polls of the public, and sociopolitical and cultural measures;
- participating in the charity movement;
- informing the public in the republic about the activity of Interfront via the press and by publishing its own press organ;

5. Any inhabitant of the republic who has attained the age of 14 years and who recognizes its program and observes the statutes and who through word and deed works to achieve the aims of Interfront may become a member of Interfront.

Citizens wishing to become members of Interfront should approach one of its organizations at their place of work or residence. Collective membership in Interfront is permitted for those united in national-cultural, professional, religious, cultural and other associations that have been established and registered in line with existing procedures.

Persons wishing to participate in the resolution of Interfront tasks but who for some reason (or motive) have not become members may cooperate with it as sympathizers and set up their own support groups, reporting this to the primary organizations or to the rayon Interfront council.

Youth groups in Interfront may be joined by persons aged 14 to 18 years.

6. A member of Interfront has the right to vote and, after attaining his majority, to be elected to any Interfront

organ, to participate in all measures conducted by Interfront, to discuss questions of Interfront activity in the press, to submit proposals, to speak out openly in defense of his opinions, to engage in measures in line with the Interfront program and statutes, and to criticize Interfront leaders and members at meetings and congresses; and to submit questions, statements and proposals to any Interfront leading organ and to receive answers on the subject matter of proposals submitted, and to enjoy legal and other protection and help from Interfront.

An Interfront member has the right freely to withdraw from Interfront after stating this to a primary organization.

7. A member of Interfront may be expelled from participation in the work of Interfront for violation of its statutes and program, for attempts to sow interethnic discord, manifestations of the administrative-bureaucratic style in work, for suppressing criticism and victimization for it, and for acts that bring infamy to Interfront.

The question of expulsion of a member is decided by a simple voting majority at a meeting of an Interfront primary organization. A decision on expulsion may be appealed in a higher Interfront organ.

Members of rayon councils may be expelled from participation in the work of Interfront or relieved of their posts in the council by a meeting of representatives of the primary organs in the rayon or by a rayon conference or the republic council.

A member of the republic council may be temporarily suspended by the council from execution of his obligations as a member of the council before a congress makes a final decision.

In the event of any member of Interfront being found criminally liable he is temporarily suspended from execution of his duties in Interfront. The question of his final expulsion is decided after a court has found him guilty.

8. Interfront is built on a territorial-production basis. Its foundation is the primary organizations that are set up at places of work or study with a minimum of three Interfront members. The primary organizations may also be set up at the place of residence of Interfront members.

9. In organizations numbering from 3 to 10 Interfront members the group leader is chosen by a show of hands at a meeting.



In organizations numbering more than 10 persons that organization's council, council chairman and treasurer are elected by a show of hands; any of them may be re-elected at any regular meeting. The number of persons on the council is decided by the meeting.

At enterprises, sovkhozes and kolkhozes, establishments, scientific research institutes and training establishments, if the council so decides groups of Interfront members may be set up within the general primary organization according to structural subdivisions. If the group so decides, a group leader is chosen at a meeting by show of hands.

The council of the Interfront primary organization organizes its work in accordance with the program and statutes and informs the organization meeting and higher organs about its activity and expenditures of monetary assets.

10. A rayon council that enjoys the rights of legal entity is set to organize and coordinate the activity of the primary organizations and implement general rayon measures for Interfront on the territory of a rural rayon; in Riga this is done for the city rayon. In cities of republic subordination city or combined city and rayon Interfront councils may be set up for the same purpose, also with the rights of legal entity.

Representatives to the council are elected at general meetings of the primary organizations in accordance with the norms of representation established by the council.

The leader, treasurer and auditing commission are elected at a meeting of the city or rayon council. The council has its own seal and bank account. It regularly informs the primary organizations and the republic council about its activity.

The rayon councils hold rayon meetings of representatives and conferences and register newly established primary organizations.

The primary organizations may make representations to higher councils for the recall of their representatives if adequate grounds exist for this.

11. The highest organ of Interfront is the republic congress, which is convened at least once annually by the republic council or when so requested by at least one-third of the members of the republic council or rayon councils and all the primary organizations.

Delegates to the republic congress are chosen from each primary organization at city or rayon conferences in accordance with the norms of representation established by the Interfront council.

An organizing committee made up of the number of persons determined by a meeting of representatives of the primary organizations and that operates before the election of the republic Interfront council at the congress is elected to make preparations for the inaugural republic congress.

12. The congresses, rayon conferences and meetings of the primary organizations and Interfront councils at all levels have the right to make decisions when a quorum of at least one-half of the members of Interfront and its representatives and delegates are present.

13. The republic congress makes decisions on the creation and liquidation of Interfront, as follows:

—it adopts the program and statutes and makes amendments to them;

—it discusses and decides the main directions of Interfront's forthcoming activity. The congress elects by show of hand a republic council that should be made up of representatives from each city and rayon council and also 5 to 7 cochairmen who form its presidium and lead it in turn for a period of time as specified by the council.

The congress elects an auditing commission and a treasurer and an editor for the press organ.

The Interfront congress hears reports and makes assessments of the activity of the republic council and of its cochairmen, the auditing commission and the editorial board of the press organ.

The congress establishes and confirms standing commissions and working groups under the republic council. It confirms the budget and the set of attributes (atributika) for Interfront, which may be prepared exceptionally with the agreement of republic council.

The congress passes resolutions by a two-thirds majority of the votes of delegates present at the congress.

14. The republic council operates in the intervals between congresses and considers and resolves all matters concerning the activity of Interfront except for matters falling exclusively within the competence of the congress.

On behalf of the Interfront the republic council submits proposals on draft laws and decisions of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet to party, state and other public organizations; issues statements and make inquiries on urgent questions of public life; establishes businesslike links with the leading organs of state, political and public organizations on questions of jointly conducting various measures; and confirms the directions of its own economic activity and the management apparatus and has a seal and a bank account.

The republic council establishes the numerical strength of the management apparatus in city and rayon councils and the funds required to maintain them.

The republic council convenes as required, but at least four times each year, and it reaches decisions by a majority vote when a quorum of two-thirds of council members is present.

The republic council informs Interfront members and the republic's population via the press and radio and television about its own work and the decisions that it adopts.

The cochairmen of the republic council in state organs and institutions, and also in public and sociopolitical organizations, act on behalf of Interfront in submitting proposals based on the Interfront program and statutes and the resolutions of its congress.

A leading cochairman with the right to sign documents adopted by the republic council and its presidium is appointed at each meeting.

15. The presidium of the republic council is a standing organ of Interfront between congresses and is made up of the cochairman and chairman of the council commission.

Meetings of the presidium are held as required under the leadership of the leading cochairman and are competent to act when at least two-thirds of the members of the presidium are present.

16. Interfront has its own property and financial assets, which are kept in bank accounts.

The main source of material and financial assets are the assets earned by Interfront members on the contract-cooperative principle, and also voluntary contributions from enterprises, establishments, cooperatives and individual citizens supporting Interfront, and members dues from Interfront members. Financial assets are transferred to the bank accounts of rayon or republic councils by bank draft. Use of financial assets is permitted only by direct designation (according to the draft).

The sizes of monthly members dues for Interfront members are established by a meeting of the primary organization. If it so decides, part of the assets are transferred to the Interfront budget and remaining assets are used by the primary organization.

Material and financial assets of Interfront are used to support organizational, economic and other activities.

17. The financial activity of the republic and rayon Interfront councils is monitored by the auditing commission elected by the congress.

The financial activity of the primary organizations of Interfront is monitored by the auditing commission of the rayon councils.

The draft statutes of the International Front of Workers of the Latvian SSR were adopted unanimously at a 19 November 1988 meeting of representatives from 157 primary organizations of Interfront and are submitted for general debate. Comments and proposals should be sent to the rayon councils or to the republic organizing committee of Interfront (226019 Riga-19, ulitsa Lomonosova, 1, tel 24-02-37, 24-01-93).

### Latvian People's Forum Resolutions

**Political Sovereignty and Economic Independence**  
18000310a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
15 Dec 88 p 3

[Unattributed report entitled: "Resolution No 1 on the Political and Economic Independence of the Latvian SSR]

[Text] Resolution No 1 on the Political Sovereignty and Economic Independence of the Latvian SSR

The forum of peoples of the LaSSR believes that the return to Leninist principles of the building of the USSR and the idea of the conclusion of a union treaty and emphatic renunciation of the policy of "autonomization" pursued by Stalin and ineradicated until now are absolutely essential for the successful development of our society and removal of the factors complicating inter-nation relations in the country in our day.

The sovereignty of Soviet Latvia, as of any other republic within the USSR, requires not only its proclamation but also the incorporation in the USSR Constitution of legal guarantees providing for its actual realization.

Political sovereignty and economic independence demand a clear-cut constitutional demarcation of the writ of all-union and republic legislation. Specifically, recognition of the country's land, waters, forests and natural resources as the property of the entire Soviet people should be specifically expressed in the sovereign right of the republic supreme soviets to look after them. This would preclude the possibility of their exploitation for selfish departmental or other egotistic purposes and would thus in practice protect property belonging to all the people.

In just the same way the priority of all-union laws and decrees cannot and must not be of a one-sided, essentially undemocratic nature actually excluding the content of the "sovereignty of the republic" concept. It should provide for an obligatory mechanism of the democratic coordination of laws and decrees with the corresponding union republics prior to their adoption, that is, unity of word and deed should be achieved in the sphere of recognition of the republics' sovereignty.

In accordance with the decisions of the 11th USSR Supreme Soviet 12th Session and for the purpose of fuller assurance of political and socioeconomic interests the republic should participate most actively in the preparation of specific proposals concerning the writ of the USSR and the legal status of the union republic and the harmonization of inter-nation relations. It is essential to begin work immediately on preparation of a new version of the LaSSR Constitution.

Realization of the principle "From each according to his abilities, to each according to the results of his labor" in respect of the republics signifies their economic independence, which is expressed primarily in the fact that the corresponding republic lives on resources earned by itself, transferring for all-state needs to the all-union budget taxes in accordance with long-term rates.

It is essential that a law be enacted in accordance with which all enterprises located on the territory of a region, irrespective of their departmental affiliation, be subordinate in questions of regulation of revenue payments to the republic authorities and participate in the formation of the local budgets. It is essential to ensure that budget revenue be formed per the "from the bottom up" principle, securing thereby the interests of the local soviets of people's deputies concerning their disposal in full of all allotted income, including payments from the activity of enterprises of local jurisdiction on the territory of the corresponding soviet. The soviets should in accordance with the limits provided for by the law be accorded the right to determine the amount of the payments depending on the extent to which the activity of the enterprise is in keeping with the economic, production, social and environmental requirements of the corresponding region.

The enterprise's firm economic ties to its region will thus be established, and all levels of soviet power will be directly concerned for the successful activity of the manufacturers, which will create the necessary conditions for the harmonization of the interests of the enterprises, the region and the country as a whole. The contribution of each republic to the country's economic well-being will be obvious.

The forum believes that it is essential to ensure that the republic's currency allowances from the export of products manufactured on its territory and from foreign trade transit shipments via republic territory and also from foreign cultural and other relations (concert activity, the export of objets d'art, sport and so forth) correspond to international practice.

It is not enough to proclaim the priority development of agriculture, what is needed is the immediate transition from good intentions to an actual action program. Under the republic's conditions this will require:

first, the allocation of additional resources to agriculture and the elaboration and introduction of a long-term program of the economic relationship of industry and agriculture for ensuring the stable development of agricultural production;

second, the orientation of large-scale state and collective farms basically toward the elaboration and introduction of modern efficient technology, seed and selection work and the processing of agricultural products;

third, the extensive development in Latvia's agriculture of modern peasant farms based on the indefinite use of land for the production of agricultural products, including the right of inheritance of land use, and also on the creation of a peasant bank, whose depositors could be industrial and agricultural enterprises and private individuals and which would provide the peasants with the necessary economic advice, credit and, in certain circumstances, outright loans;

fourth, equal conditions for the peasants with state and cooperative agricultural enterprises in material-technical supply and other fields;

fifth, the elimination of breaches of social justice expressed in guaranteed all-union meat supplies at the expense of an improvement in their supply to the population of the republic;

sixth, observance of the principles of social justice in the allocation of resources and assets between individual areas of the republic, proceeding from the need for equalization of the level of infrastructural provision.

Independence in the formation of one's own budget and in providing the population with food will create a real basis for a strengthening of the national economy of both the republic and the USSR as a whole.

#### Ecological Situation

18000210 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
15 Dec 88 p 3

[Unattributed report entitled: "Resolution No 2 on the Ecological Situation on the Territory of the LaSSR"]

[Text] Resolution No 2 on the Ecological Situation on the Territory of the LaSSR

The forum of peoples of the LaSSR expresses profound concern in connection with the sharp deterioration in the ecological situation on the territory of the republic. The ecological crisis has already affected Ventspils, Yurmala and Olayne and, partially, Riga, the majority of Latvia's lakes and the Baltic. For us it is obvious that the destruction of Latvia's nature complex has led to the disruption of the stability of the natural processes of the republic and the entire surrounding region and a deterioration in the health and the reduced longevity of the population.



The irresponsible approach to planning of the republic Gosplan, the economic activity of many ministries and also activities conducted on Latvian territory by all-union departments and ministries with the consent of the republic's government or without such have already put in jeopardy the basis of life in the republic—the purity of the air and the water and the quality of food products. For example, the Ventspils Port Plant and the special trains arriving at the plant with caustic and toxic substances are threatening the ecological safety of a vast territory of the republic and, in the event of an accident, could cause thousands of human casualties.

The forum of the peoples expresses the certainty that a radical solution of ecological problems in Latvia is possible only given a fundamental change in the economic mechanism of management, a struggle conducted at all levels against selfish departmental interests and the introduction of progressive nature-sparing and resource-saving technology. Man's activity pertaining to an increase in gross production at any price, disregarding nature and its possibilities, has become the principal factor leading to the destruction of Latvia's natural environment.

We call on the leaders of industry and agriculture of Soviet Latvia, union departments and scientists to recognize their social responsibility to present and future generations for the decisions they adopt and the consequences of their realization for the ecological situation in the republic.

The forum believes that the exacerbation of ecological and socioeconomic problems in the republic has been caused by the hypertrophied development of large-waste and material- and energy-consuming industry; the lack of provision of the agro-industrial complex with agricultural equipment and technology corresponding to regional natural conditions has led to the predominance of extensive methods of managing agricultural production; nitrogen fertilizer is being used in excessive quantities, which is dangerous for the health of people and animals in connection with the accumulation of nitrates in food products. The maximum permissible doses of toxic chemicals for combating pests and weeds are regularly exceeded. This is causing the contamination not only of products but bodies of water of the republic with residual toxic substances.

At the present time it is not enough just preventing new ecological mistakes and crimes. The republic's scientific, technical and intellectual potential must be geared to the elimination of the damage that has already been caused nature; a long-term program of the improvement and renewal of natural resources is essential.

The forum believes that an obligatory condition for a cardinal improvement in the ecological situation is the republic's real sovereignty.

The forum believes that the resources allocated from state capital investments for the solution of problems of the environment are manifestly insufficient for the adoption of urgent measures to put a stop to the runoff of unpurified waters into Latvia's rivers, the Bay of Riga and the Baltic. In fact these modest resources do not permit compliance with the requirements of international agreements on protection of the Baltic, which is leading to the critical level of pollution being exceeded and most serious consequences for the population of the republic. The forum recognizes that the construction of a complex of purification installations of the city of Riga (including enterprise purification installations) is a vitally important project for all peoples of the republic; contributing to the erection of the complex is the patriotic duty of every inhabitant of Latvia.

For an improvement in the ecological situation of the republic:

1. The forum proposes that the LaSSR Council of Ministers and all soviets, enterprises and organizations revise and supplement their programs pertaining to nature-conservation measures and tighten the penalties in respect of organizations and persons which continue to inflict damage on nature. Considering the critical state of the environment, establish the permanent priority of protection of the environment and prohibit the construction and expansion of any national economic facility without the consent of the local soviets. Obligatorily provide for the necessary measures which provide in full for preservation of the environment.

2. The forum demands the comprehensive ecological and economic expert appraisal of the production and nature-conservation activity of each enterprise of LaSSR industry without exception, considering here total outlays for the achievement of the ecologically permissible level of production: in the event of ascertainment of unprofitability, that production be suspended. Energy- and material-consuming purification installations should be re-oriented toward the creation of modern facilities, for which it is necessary in the republic to organize production enterprises providing for the construction and maintenance of nature-conservation installations.

3. The forum believes that the Latvian national economy should be oriented toward ecologically clean production with the use of relatively harmless energy resources. We should abandon the construction on Latvian territory of an AES of any current type and also powerful GES. It would be expedient to use in the Baltic alternative energy sources, including wind power, bioenergetics and other forms of energy, as is the case in Denmark and Sweden, and also to seek economies thanks to the rational use of existing energy and the introduction of energy-saving technology.

4. To avoid the consequences of possible accidents during transit shipments of ecologically dangerous loads the forum calls the attention of the republic government

to the need for the immediate elaboration of a comprehensive plan for the construction of bypass railroads avoiding Riga, Yurmala and other densely populated points of Latvia.

5. The forum approves the justified demand of the inhabitants of Ventspils and Ventspilsskiy Rayon concerning the immediate reprofiling of the Ventspils Port Plant in order that the plant manufacture products which are not harmful to the inhabitants and the environment.

6. The forum advocates ecologically clean agricultural production and the ecologically substantiated and rational use of Latvia's forests; and believes that questions of the protection and improvement of the environment should apply also to the territories of the republic which are in the charge of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

7. The forum demands that the location of industrial, residential and recreational zones correspond to the Latvia's geographical environment and that land in agriculture be used with regard for the regional topography, climatic singularities and soil type.

8. The forum supports the initiative of the Latvian Culture Foundation and the Latvian Society for the Protection of Nature and Monuments pertaining to the ecology of the culture and the revival of the cultural and landscape environment, which has taken shape over centuries, of Latvia and preservation of the cultural and historical heritage.

The forum believes that periodical publications illustrating the problems of the ecology and also questions of the formation of the cultural environment, the history of Latvia and the protection of monuments are essential, as is contributing in every possible way to the familiarization of the inhabitants of different nationalities of the republic with the traditions of the history and culture of Latvia and the adaptation of these inhabitants to the local cultural environment.

9. The forum supports the proposals concerning discussion at an LaSSR Supreme Soviet session of the problems of the ecological crisis in the republic, including questions of material-technical support for the nature-conservation bodies.

#### **National Cultural Development of National and Ethnic Groups**

18000310 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
15 Dec 88 p 3

[Unattributed report entitled: "Resolution No 3 on the Cultural and National Development of National and Ethnic Groups in the LaSSR"]

[Text] Resolution No 3 on the Cultural and National Development of National and Ethnic Groups in the LaSSR

The forum of peoples of Latvia recognizes that the growth of national self-awareness and the aspiration of each people to develop its own language and native culture is an inalienable part of the process of the renewal of socialist society.

In the years of Stalinism and the Brezhnev stagnation there was a departure from Leninist principles of nationality policy, and the cultural and historical traditions of Latvia's national cultural societies were completely lost. This has been a factor of the deformation of inter-nation relations. The free development of the cultures of all national and ethnic groups permanently resident on the territory of the LaSSR is an important condition for the general development of the culture of the republic and an improvement in inter-nation relations.

The question of rights and opportunities for all national and ethnic groups to realize their national and cultural requirements, particularly in the sphere of education, contacts and folk creativity, create centers of their own national culture, use the mass media and satisfy religious requirements is urgent and requires solution.

1. The forum of peoples of the LaSSR believes that state authorities of the LaSSR are responsible for the creation of conditions conducive to the development of the language and culture of all national and ethnic groups permanently resident in the republic and that the Lettish nation is morally responsible for their all-around cultural development.

2. The forum believes that at the time of the elaboration of a new version of the LaSSR Constitution and other legislative instruments it is essential to examine questions of legal backing for the cultural and national interests of national and ethnic groups of the LaSSR. To determine here the legal status of national cultural societies and their financial support from resources of the state budget and the right of the national cultural societies to put forward their candidates for deputies of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet and the local soviets.

3. The forum believes that for the full satisfaction of the cultural requirements of the national and ethnic groups it is essential to guarantee them:

the opportunity of tuition in national schools, classes, Sunday national schools and elective groups per a program providing for study of the native language, literature, history and art;

the creation and activity of national cultural societies, centers and clubs and their associations and the requisite premises;

free cultural relations and a constant exchange of information with their historical homeland both within the USSR and outside;

realization of citizens' personal contacts with citizens of their historical homeland, including the right to organize and practice individual and group trips abroad;

participation in activities staged by analogous overseas cultural associations.

4. The forum considers it necessary:

to create favorable conditions for the popularization of the folklore and fine, musical and theatrical art of the nationalities and national and ethnic groups living in Latvia;

to create conditions for the restoration and development of the traditions of national and ancient popular holidays (for example, Christmas, Easter, Shrovetide and others);

to contribute to the publication of periodicals and books in languages of the Latvian peoples;

to periodically illustrate in the media (the press, radio, television) pertinent issues of the cultural life of all nations, nationalities and national groups living in Latvia.

5. The forum deems it expedient to create in the system of the LaSSR Academy of Sciences an institute for study of Latvian culture, which would also study the culture, history, ethnography and traditions of all nationalities and national groups living in Latvia.

6. The forum deems it necessary to broaden the rights of various religions to participate in the social and cultural life of the LaSSR.

7. The forum welcomes the creation of the Association of National Cultural Societies of Latvia, which at the present time incorporates 16 such societies.

8. For the more active enlistment of representatives of all peoples and nationalities resident on the territory of the LaSSR in the solution of pertinent questions of a national and inter-nation nature the forum considers it essential to create under the auspices of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet a consultative council of nationalities.

### **Workers' Involvement in Lithuanian Sajudis Urged**

18120050 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English  
No 52, 1-8 Jan 89 p 10

[Article by Nina Belyayeva]

[Text]

### **Thoughts about Sajudis, the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroika**

"Look how jubilant the people are, everyone in this large hall! You Russians are a large nation and can hardly understand us. Regaining our national dignity, which has been denied for so long, means a lot for us."

Perhaps it is indeed difficult for an outsider to understand when almost every sharp critical remark or mention of the national colours—yellow, green and red—is immediately followed by a standing ovation, chanting or singing.

That's how it was at the Vilnius Palace of Sports during the Sajudis movement's first congress.

Over two months, crowded with important developments in the popular movements in the Soviet Baltic Republics, have elapsed since that congress. The initial emotional reaction has subsided, and now we can, and perhaps ought to, recall what was said at the congress if we want to clarify certain important issues.

*"Forget the word 'people'. It's an abstraction. Even the most heinous of crimes have been committed 'in the interest of the people'. The abstract and faceless 'people' are always silent. What is contrary to that is the individuality of the national face and the unity among people with a historic destiny of their own. You again aim at depriving us of our individuality as you try to impose one universal social division on us. What else could be behind your questions?"*

As a matter of fact, the questions I asked at the press conference of the participants in the congress were as follows:

"Are there any workers in the Sajudis initiative group? And how many? Do the initiative group members believe that they fully represent the interests of all strata of the Republic's population?"

The answer sounded like a reaction to an offensive remark.

Vytautas Petkevicius, author:

*"Intellectuals are the brain and conscience of a nation. Unfortunately, the Party believed it represented the peasants and workers and, consequently, established corresponding quotas to be observed for a long time to come. By not admitting people of talent, intellectuals, the Party virtually turned into a quotaed caste."*

Stormy applause. The speaker takes his seat in triumph. But who did he win over?

The question about workers' participation was not a loaded one. Lithuania has more grounds to be proud about worker involvement in perestroika than any other



Soviet Republic. It is there that perhaps the most active workers' clubs first appeared at industrial enterprises. It is Lithuanian workers who were among the initiators of an intercity club, Workers' Trust. Lithuanian workers have always shown good organization—something to be emulated in other regions.

Why would the "people of talent intellectuals" not be proud patriots?

Workers constitute a large part of Sajudis and provide reliable support. They can prove to be the most reliable part of all, if not denied their own role and a right to represent their own interests.

**Vytautas Petkevicius:**

*"Intellectuals don't appear from out of thin air; we all originate from workers and peasants. The state and the society should be managed by people of intellectual power rather than people of some special social background. (Applause.) We all very well know where Lenin's romantic maxim about a cook managing a state has led us." (Applause.)*

That was an unjust and painful remark. Besides, it is a misquotation distorting Lenin's idea. I could feel disappointment grow due to a lack of understanding.

The question once asked would probably not have been worthy of serious discussion were it not for the fact that the majority of Sajudis members believe that representation from various social strata (instead of some formal share of dairy and steel workers) is not only not necessary, but even detrimental, because it causes divisiveness rather than national unity.

The congress was attended by 1,021 delegates and 167 candidates to the Sajudis' Sejm, 68 per cent of whom had a higher education. Out of every hundred delegates, 19 were engineers, 28 either scientists or artists, and 33 were cultural and religious workers and representatives from the legal and medical professions. Although the initiative group rightfully believes that one's social background is of no great importance, questionnaires for the delegates included this question. According to data from the credentials committee, 20 per cent of the delegates were from worker families and 29 per cent from peasant families. However, as few as 44 workers proper were elected to the congress. The number of people representing the peasants was eight (mainly collective farm chairmen). As many as 167 delegates were either Candidates or Doctors of Science.

Let's take an unbiased approach and admit that it was a congress of intellectuals. I'll stress that that's a fact. Now let's see whether this is good or bad. My opinion is that it's very good. The composition of delegates clearly and honestly revealed which of the social strata was the first to champion perestroika and to actively participate in the process.

In connection with this, I'll point out the role played by Lithuania's intellectuals. Authors Petkevicius, Cepaitis, and Marcinkevicius, Academician Buracas, publisher Ozolas, music specialist Landsbergis, philosopher Genzelis and many others shed their intellectual endeavours for a while and became propagandists eager to speak to any audience, even in the remotest regions of the Republic. They raised people's actual concerns, in order to explain things to them, to enlighten and unite them. This unification is largely due to their common culture, language and history. Therefore, its main motive and basis at present are formed by the idea of a national renaissance, a development of national sovereignty providing for effective solutions for all other issues. These include social, cultural and economic issues.

Lithuania's experience, and that of the whole Baltic region for that matter, has proved that a national basis is ideal for an earliest possible consolidation of social forces and the creation of a united front.

But might not such advertised unity lead to yet more self-delusion in the future? We are united by the necessity of facing the common problems. However, that cannot eliminate our specific interests which might conflict with each other: while demanding the immediate closure of a chemical plant, we should think where its present employees will be employed tomorrow. Various social strata should be represented in Sajudis in order to learn how to reveal and match these interests, rather than intentionally counterpose them or conceal differences under the cover of national unity. Then there will be more grounds to regard Sajudis as a popular rather than national movement.

**Arunas Brazauskas, economist, delegate to the congress from the Green Movement, came up with an integral programme:**

*"Apparently, the masses are only just starting to master the art of advancing programmes and identifying objectives, because until now they mainly had to deal with programmes imposed on them. Different layers of society are sure, sooner or later, to come up with their own objectives within the framework of the national programme of perestroika."*

**Kazimieras Uoka, bulldozer operator, congress delegate from the Kaunas constituency (an elected member of the Sajudis' Sejm):**

*"Indeed, workers' mentalities still remain one-sided and fragmented. Nevertheless, the workers movement is steadily gathering momentum. We don't aspire to 'manage the state', but we're able to present and protect our interests. I think, we'll have a powerful and independent workers movement in a year's time. As for our programmes, we have started to formulate them in our*

*hearts, rather than in manifestos. It's necessary to gather workers together, have the feel of their attitudes and let them say their say, before we embark on compiling an actual programme."*

**Vytautas Vilkenis, assembler, Yashumsk pilot-production plant, delegate from the Vilnius constituency:**

*"I think that it is up to us workers to prove that the congress's decisions are not empty words and that the present movement in Lithuania is not confined to Lithuanians, but rather concerns everyone living in the Republic and that we stand for remaining a socialist state. There are few workers at the congress, me being the only representative in the Vilnius council. True, intellectuals are better organized, but they also have much more free time. As for me, there's no telephone by the machine tool I operate. All issues have to be discussed after work."*

We didn't have to wait long for that. Three hundred delegates from 70 industrial enterprises in Kaunas set up the Kaunas Workers Union, complete with an elected council. They set themselves the following goals: to reshape the trade-union committees at their factories, to make the factory newspapers better correspond to the ideas of perestroika, to ensure a legal defence for workers so they can defend against arbitrariness on the part of factory managers. Similar unions are being set up in Vilnius and Klaipeda as well.

Leaders of national movements particularly in the Baltic Republics, were the first to undertake this vast responsibility. There isn't any point for us to suppress their views. Their problems and their experience is part of the common democracy we are learning. And it is a hard thing to learn. Sajudis' response to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's decision to back the drafts of the laws concerning elections and changes in the USSR Constitution looked like an obstruction. But why? Isn't the best way to defend one's viewpoint through a democratic dialogue? Would it have been easier to find agreement with one's own parliament had Sajudis represented the opinion of the working class as well, and not just intellectuals?

It would be a great mistake not to allow intellectuals' involvement in these revolutionary processes. We once experienced such a mistake. But isn't it an even greater mistake to exclude workers from the process, dividing them on an ethnic level to boot?

#### **Pros, Cons of Lithuania's Yedinstvo Movement Debated**

18000360a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
1 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by M. Burokyavichyus, professor and doctor of historical sciences: "Two Viewpoints": "Clarity of Ideological Positions"]

[Text] I do not belong to any informal organizations, and I am not a member of the Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring (Sayudis) or the Socialist Movement for

Restructuring in Lithuania (Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost). Therefore I feel that I can assess their activities more or less objectively, assuming that both Sayudis and Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost have equal rights to express the opinions of certain segments of society, and that at the same time neither of them has a right to claim a monopoly on the opinions of all the working people of Soviet Lithuania. Therefore both of these movements should avoid confrontation and mutual political accusations, because these things are incompatible with socialist pluralism and could easily be transformed into political blackmail. Something that V. I. Lenin said is appropriate in this context: "Political blackmail is the threat to reveal or the revelation of actual or, as is most often the case, contrived 'incidents' with the aim of causing political harm, diverting or removing an opponent or causing him difficulty in his political work." ("Complete Works", Vol 34, p 90)

Sayudis and Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost are not opposites. The movements' programmatic documents stress that they are striving to accelerate the process of restructuring that is presently underway in our country. I think that they could work together more closely and help the Lithuanian CP implement restructuring policy.

In this article I would like to express some of my ideas concerning a declaration and statement by the Socialist Movement for Restructuring in Lithuania which were published in republic newspapers. The declaration by Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost was based on the new redaction of the CPSU Program and the points in the resolution adopted at the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Thus it essentially reflects the problems of restructuring and timely issues in the life of Soviet society. Of course, a declaration is no substitute for a program, which should present the movement's tasks in a more detailed fashion; a declaration is merely a brief formulation of its objective.

However, first of all I would like to note that it contains just criticism of Stalinism and the flagrant, criminal distortion of the principles of socialist construction which occurred in the past. It also includes the following statement: "We will struggle persistently to hallow the memory of all the victims of fascism as well as Stalinism and of all the Soviet activists who died during the years when Soviet power was being established in Lithuania." This approach is fully in line with the historical truth.

The Socialist Movement for Restructuring in Lithuania states that it supports the Communist Party's policy of fully realizing Leninist ideas of socialism and the creation of a humane and democratic socialist society which will provide for people's happiness and prosperity and their all-round spiritual improvement and will help overcome alienation from the means of production, as well as its policy of strengthening and expanding real social guarantees which will give socialism back its true meaning. The movement also states that it will take positions in favor of social justice, agitate for solutions to

social and ecological problems, attempt to block administrative-command methods of leadership, work for revocation of all undeserved privileges, struggle to raise the living standard of poor families and support young families, the families of internationalist soldiers, individuals living alone and the elderly. It would be good if the Socialist Movement for Restructuring in Lithuania would realize these noble aims in its practical work, aid organs of state authority and administrative organs in working more actively and help meet people's needs more swiftly and efficiently.

Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost states, in full accordance with the interests of the citizens of Soviet Lithuania, that it favors a socialist state governed by law—the Soviet Union; it is also in favor of democracy, glasnost, the granting of economic independence to republics, regional cost-accounting, self-administration by workers at enterprises and socialist property belonging to all the people.

The Socialist Movement for Restructuring in Lithuania has expressed its opinion on the nationalities question. First and foremost it stands for a consistent, democratic solution to nationalities issues in Soviet Lithuania; secondly it states that it will support and defend the interests and political rights of all citizens of Soviet Lithuania regardless of their ethnicity or religion; thirdly, it will strive to unite people of all nationalities in the performance of common tasks; fourthly, in accordance with the principles of Leninist internationalism it condemns all manifestations of chauvinism and nationalism; fifthly, it favors all-round strengthening of the union of sovereign republics—the USSR. For the USSR is a federation, not a confederation of states.

The movement intends to devote a great deal of attention to the development of ethnic cultures and to their mutual enrichment; it will work to promote an attitude favorable to preservation of the historical legacy of the nations and peoples residing in the LiSSR. I think the declaration should express a clearer and more clear-cut opinion as to the status of Lithuanian as an official language. True, this is done in another document, the statement, which includes the following: "The working group of Yedinstvo respects all decisions made by a session of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet and recognizes the legal force of those decisions." Let us recall that at the latest session Lithuanian was constitutionally established as the official language, the national flag consisting of yellow, green and red stripes, was made the official flag, and an official anthem, "National Song" by V. Kudirka, was adopted. Newspapers have also published for the purpose of discussion a draft of the proposed LiSSR Supreme Soviet Decree "On the Use of Lithuanian and Other Languages."

I do not think it would be appropriate to create two houses within the LiSSR Supreme Soviet, as is suggested in the Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost declaration. In my opinion it is sufficient to have a permanent commission

of deputies under the LiSSR Supreme Soviet assigned to handle ethnic matters. I think that such commissions could also be established under local soviets of people's deputies in regions with a mixed population. They should also of course be more active.

I regard as positive the fact that the Socialist Movement for Restructuring in Lithuania, as its declaration states, acknowledges the guiding role of the Communist Party and will stand firmly on the tenets of Marxism-Leninism and communist ideology. I was also impressed by the fact that this movement has set itself the goal of fostering people's moral, patriotic and humanistic education. This will help the movement draw up a correct program of action and win the confidence of our republic's working people.

The Socialist Movement for Restructuring in Lithuania declares that it unites and accepts as members any citizen or group of people, party members, non-party members and persons of any age, ethnic background or religious belief. I think that if blue-collar workers, collective farm members, members of the intelligentsia and young workers and students take part in the movement this informal organization will not become exclusive.

Also worthy of attention is a statement issued by the Socialist Movement for Restructuring in Lithuania on 22 November 1988, which states that Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost is decidedly in favor of taking existing realities into account and condemns any and all manifestations of adventurism, which objectively undermine the process of restructuring and democratization of public life. Every informal organization must realize that acts of extremism are incompatible with socialist legality and hamper the development of democracy. I am opposed to any picketing organized by either Sayudis or by Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost, regardless of its motivation. It would be good if Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost would devote more attention to instilling in people nobleness, inner spiritual culture, responsibility and respect both for the Soviet Union and for my native republic, Soviet Lithuania. Furthermore, I would like the Socialist Movement for Restructuring in Lithuania to work on improving studies on the history of the Lithuanian people and the teaching of Lithuanian at schools where Russian and Polish are the languages of instruction. This would bring people from different ethnic groups closer together and would help them to better know and love the republic in which they live.

The restrained, well-balanced tone of documents issued by Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost strengthen its ideological position and social aspirations. As its documents state, this movement is striving to consolidate the socialist society of Soviet Lithuania and is striving to help the Lithuanian CP get the working people of our republic actively involved in restructuring work so that the tasks set by the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th Party Conference can be carried out successfully. I wish it success in the socialist rebirth of society, since



"socialism," wrote V. I. Lenin, "is not created by orders from above. The automaton-like behavior of official bureaucracy is foreign to its nature; socialism is alive and creative, is the creation of the masses of the people themselves." ("Complete Works," Vol 35 p 57) M.

Burokyavichyus  
Professor, Doctor of historical Sciences

...

At a meeting with young people from Moscow and the surrounding region in connection with the Komsomol's 70th anniversary, M. S. Gorbachev rightly affirmed that answers to many questions that are of importance today can be found in Lenin's creative legacy. The party's General Secretary also pointed out that these answers are often not and cannot be direct and explicit in every detail. He also noted that we must study the Leninist method, Leninist dialectics and the Leninist attitude toward analysis of social processes. That is the art which we must master.

Lenin's exceptionally rich and extensive legacy also contains quite a few specific answers to some present-day questions. One realizes this very clearly when time and again attempting to interpret a short ELTA report which stated that on 2 November an organizational meeting of a new socialist movement called Yedinstvo was held. This event, which occurred 10 days after the founding congress of the Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring, probably came as a shock to others besides the author of this article. I believe that this evokes a strong sense of dissatisfaction on the part of the entire Lithuanian people. Therefore it was no coincidence that I chose the title of a work by V. I. Lenin as the title of this article.

Lenin wrote his work "On the Destruction of Unity Disguised With Proclamations of Unity" [O narushenii yedinstva, prikrybayemom krikami o yedinstve] (see: "Complete Works," Vol 25) in the spring of 1914 while living in Poland. In it the leader of the Bolshevik Party convincingly demonstrates how improper and treacherous were the actions of participants in the at that time already substantially disintegrated, minority anti-party August Bloc, i.e. a handful of liquidators, "non-aligned" Trotsky and several circles of intellectuals operating abroad who had parted ways with the party masses.

Yet what does this specific situation in the Russian workers' movement and the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party which arose on the eve of World War I have to do with events in Lithuania in October and early November 1988? Naturally there is no fabulous direct connection, yet there is no doubt that this is a repetition of the principle of the aggregate of a political movement and relations between a part of that aggregate and the whole. These are painful, dramatic relations, and it is very good that we can consider them in their theoretical aspect as well. That aspect calms emotions to a certain extent and lessens the confusion in people's minds.

At first glance it might seem that upon reading the aforementioned ELTA report one should rejoice: another socialist movement with a great number of the most noble objectives has come into being. However, any person who considers himself a Marxist has no right to go into euphoria over mere pretty words and statements. Very many questions that cause one to doubt the noble goals of the new movement come to mind unbidden. Why are people attempting to create a new movement at all when Sayudis would gladly welcome Lithuanians and members of all the other ethnic groups in Lithuania into its ranks, when the leaders of Sayudis include Russians, Poles, Jews and other nationalities? Has Sayudis rebuffed a single "internationalist soldier" or other citizen standing "on the broadest social and ethnic foundation" (ELTA excels at writing gibberish!)? Finally, is Yedinstvo perhaps trying to present a fundamentally new program of action that is more correct than the one offered by Sayudis? Anyone who is even slightly acquainted with Sayudis' exhaustive and constructive program could not feel that we need anything fundamentally new in that regard. (Unfortunately neither our editorial staff nor the majority of our republic's citizens are familiar with this exhaustive and constructive program, since all that has been submitted for discussion was a draft of the document; thus we cannot make any judgment concerning the final version—SOVETSKAYA LITVA commentary) So why should a new movement be founded? What sort of unity are its initiators attempting to achieve? Because it should be perfectly clear to everyone that not a single Lithuanian will sign up for the new movement, since Sayudis already exists. That means that what is planned is not unity of all the people of Lithuania, but rather of all the non-Lithuanian nationalities in Lithuania...

Against whom could such unity be directed?

Unfortunately the answer to that question is self-evident...

It is a great pity that L. Shepetis, LiSSR CP Central Committee secretary, practically gave his blessing to this obvious act of ill will designed to create division in society and increase confrontation, in a speech on the "governmental podium" of television. His reasoning was that, it would be good if this fosters the progress which everyone is waiting for, but it would be bad if matters took a turn in the direction of confrontation. Is not the attempt by the planned movement to isolate itself from, to reject both Sayudis and the Lithuanian people the beginning of confrontation? As we know, the beginning of something is always moderate and modest. Let us permit the movement to get started, expand and grow stronger. Then we will see.

Comrade L. Shepetis is probably very afraid of being labeled a nationalist, therefore he has decided to pretend that he does not feel that the idea of Yedinstvo exudes a scarcely perceptible scent of great-power chauvinism... It is even worse if Comrade L. Shepetis does not smell that scent. A chronic head cold would be the only explanation for that.

I invite you once again to listen carefully to the thoughts of Lenin in order to discern who is worried by the success of our organization and of restructuring. "There is nothing easier than writing the word 'unity' in huge letters, than praising it and 'proclaiming' oneself a supporter of it... Unity is impossible without organization. Organization is impossible without the submission of the minority to the majority." ("Complete Works," Vol 15, p 177)

It would seem that everything is clear and simple, would it not? But that is only the way it seems. Our brothers the Russians, the Poles, the Belorussians and the members of other nationalities living in Lithuania have many questions, many doubts and differing opinions. I invite all people of good will to express their opinion, especially those who do not regard Lithuania as an oblast of the Russian Federation, who do not think that Vilnius should be ceded to Poland and Klaipeda to Germany, etc. I think that in Lithuania these people, the rational people, are in the majority and that in the future there will be somewhat more of mutual understanding and respect. Let those who support the idea of Yedinstvo express their opinions, too. It would be interesting to watch them curse and gnash their teeth with rage. But they should be forewarned that the effectiveness of demagoguery has declined significantly of late. Three years of restructuring have knocked the main props out from under demagoguery, and it was always founded on high posts and ranks and even on scientific degrees and titles. All this provided a reliable camouflage for the real face of the demagogue: greedy, amoral and dull-witted. Now, thank God, we can look at him and show him to others as he really is.

Recently the press published a rather voluminous declaration by the new movement which unfortunately amply confirmed our worst fears. Even if one takes its terribly worn and contrived phrases seriously, then one would be forced to admit that this declaration contains absolutely nothing that is not in Sayudis' program of action. The only innovation in the declaration, the cornerstone of the whole movement, is an effort to prevent Lithuanian from being made the official language of the LiSSR and a desire to have the Council of Nationalities resolve all interethnic problems in our republic. Well, the truth will prevail in the end. It is a pity that some Lithuanian Stalinists have been found who have decided to "save socialism" through Yedinstvo. Their resolve is completely legitimate, but painful for all of us.

Sayudis welcomes all the people of Lithuania regardless of their ethnicity, social status, religion, age, etc. Sayudis represents true unity, not contrived unity, and naturally it is not directed against the Lithuanian people. Now that unity is being threatened, as we know, by powerful forces.

A. Visotiskas

Scientific editor of the Translation Section of the Classics of Marxism-Leninism  
Institute of Party History under the  
Lithuanian CP Central Committee

### Groups for Supporting Lithuania's Yedinstvo Movement Formed

18000360b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
8 Dec 88 p 3

#### ["Meeting of Yedinstvo Support Groups"]

[Text] A meeting of persons representing Vilnius primary support groups for the Venibe-Yedinstvo-Yednost socialist movement for restructuring in Lithuania was held. At the meeting it was announced that 162 primary groups of the movement have been formed in the city, with a total membership of 27,000. Over 80 percent of the members are blue-collar workers.

The process of establishing Yedinstvo primary support groups is continuing in other cities and rayons around Lithuania. The Klaipeda organization of Yedinstvo, established previously, has held its citywide conference.

At the meeting a resolution was passed defining the tasks and aims of organizational work in preparation for city and rayon founding conferences and a republic congress of the movement. A commission to prepare a draft program for Yedinstvo has been established and is already at work.

At the meeting a resolution was passed concerning participation in elections to labor collective councils at industrial enterprises and associations. In Yedinstvo's opinion the labor collective councils, which have been granted very broad powers, should become a truly democratic organ of labor collective self-administration and undermine bureaucratic, command-administrative methods of economic management.

Those attending the meeting called on the LiSSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade, the collective of the LiSSR Academy of Sciences Lithuanian Language Institute and Lithuanian specialists to speed up publication of Lithuanian-Russian and Lithuanian-Polish dictionaries and create up-to-date methodologies and a curriculum for the study of Lithuanian by member of other language groups.

### Renewed Efforts Needed To Preserve Siberian Languages

18000321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 88 p 3

[Article under "The USSR Is Our Common Home" rubric by A. Derevyanko, academician, director, IIFiF (History of Philology and Philosophy Institute), USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Division; Ye. Ubryatova, professor, Honored Scientist of the Yakutsk and Tuva ASSR's; M. Cheremisina, professor, chief, Siberian Peoples' Languages Sector, IIFiF, USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Division: "It's Still Not Too Late!"]

[Text] The young Soviet regime invested considerable efforts to elevate our country's minority peoples. The first condition for bringing this about was elementary education, which had to be conducted in the native languages.

*inasmuch as Siberia's indigenous population, with few exceptions, were not fluent in Russian at that time. The state nationality policy took this into account; at the beginning of the 1930's an enormous amount of work was carried out with regard to creating writing systems for our country's 52 peoples.*

This work proceeded with particular activity in Siberia. There was a widespread development of teaching in the native language, together with a parallel instruction in Russian. Not only children were taught to write, but also adults, who eagerly flocked to acquire this new skill. Primers and readers were created in the native languages; newspapers were published; and the translation of socially significant information proceeded actively. As a result, there was a sharp rise in the cultural level of the minority peoples, primarily of the youth who were studying at that time: by the end of the 1930's the backbone of a national intelligentsia had already been formed; it had obtained a secondary education and was striving to acquire a higher education.

Most unfortunately, these positive trends in the development of Siberia's minority peoples were broken off by the tragic events of the late 1930's and the 1940's. Many enthusiastic supporters of the movement—linguists specializing in Siberian studies—were subjected to repressions. The war, which eliminated a considerable part of the young national intelligentsia, inflicted enormous damage on the cultural development of Siberia's peoples and to the incipient linguistic study of their languages, while the postwar policy maintained this onerous state of affairs for many long years. Right down to the very late 1970's the native languages were not used for teaching in the junior grades. Primers, textbooks, and readers, which had become unnecessary, grew worthless and were sometimes even destroyed; the training of instructors to teach the native languages was sharply curtailed. It did not succeed in regaining the level which had been achieved during the 1930's.

Siberia has more than 40 languages, counting the major dialects as well; the prospects for their future development are not equal. Some peoples number less than a thousand persons, a considerable portion of whom are no longer fluent in their native language. This stems from the process of assimilation and is inevitable, although onerous for the generation on whose century it falls. It is senseless to retard this process, but it is also criminal to accelerate it. The obligation of linguistic science, and, above all, Siberia's scholars, is to take all possible measures to support those languages which can still be of service to their people, whereas the vanishing languages must be preserved for science as a cultural value for all mankind: because, of course, every language constitutes a unique phenomenon, a creation of the human spirit, a treasure-house of its people's historical experience; every language preserves within itself a unique picture of the world, as perceived by the particular human collective in question. If it is mankind's destiny to continue existing, as the years go by, it will

certainly turn to the cultural and linguistic heritage of Siberia's departed peoples. Future scholars will have to restore from bits and pieces that which nowadays they can still simply record in writing.

But not all of the languages of Siberia's peoples are ending their existence in the presently expiring millennium. Many of them are now undergoing a process of rebirth. National self-awareness is becoming stronger; literary customs are being developed; and a body of belletristic texts is growing. In connection with this, the problem of effectively teaching the native languages in school has become exacerbated, and the training of qualified teachers is being placed on the agenda. But this is impossible without theoretically working out the problems of grammar, phonetics, and lexicology.

Meanwhile, the problem of personnel in the field of Siberian languages, the system of training them and providing job slots is becoming extremely acute. The situation which has evolved can justifiably be termed disastrous. Of course, it is not the same everywhere. Yakutiya and Buratiya have branches of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Division with strong linguistic sectors, where even doctors of sciences are employed; and there are VUZ's with national divisions. Tuva has no branch of the Academy of Sciences Siberian Division; there is only a small (10-12 persons) sector of the local NII. Nevertheless, Tuva is a republic; the situation is still more gravely serious in the autonomous republics. And the national okrugs have neither NII's nor VUZ's—merely branches which have been assigned the tasks of compiling primers, readers, school glossaries and all methodological work with the teachers; they lack either the forces or the incentives to do anything more. The Khanty languages, which is closely related to Hungarian, can serve as a specific illustration. It is studied in Hungary, the GDR, FRG, Finland, and in the United States. Any item published in Khanty—as well as in Mansi [Vogul], the second Ob-Ugor language—is immediately included in the circulation of a world-wide bibliography. But extremely few such items appear in Soviet publications.

Leningrad and Moscow were traditionally the centers for studying the languages of the Siberian peoples. Nowadays it is perfectly logical that such a center is gradually shifting eastward—to Siberia. The newer scientific centers in the localities—in Ulan-Ude, Kyzyl, Gorno-Altaysk, etc.—are keying more and more on nearby Novosibirsk. During the postwar years the Tomsk Pedagogical Institute has become a major scientific center for the study of Siberian languages.

It may seem that many young specialists have been trained here and that the situation with regard to scientific manpower is completely favorable. However, the overwhelming majority of them are foreign-language instructors at Siberian VUZ's; under the conditions whereby the linguistic subdivisions of the Academy of Sciences Siberian Division have remained virtually



undeveloped, this was the only genuine possibility for them, even though it was not the purpose for which these subdivisions were created. By their efforts, the VUZ instructors have accomplished an enormous amount of work on the multifaceted study of Siberian languages. However, the great amount of labor invested in their training as highly skilled Siberian-studies specialists all too often "disappears into the sand;" because, after all, when they return to their own VUZ's upon completing their graduate work, these instructors have neither the strength nor the time for effective scientific work.

We must recruit specialists in all lines of research without delay for those subdivisions of the Academy of Sciences which have linguistic collectives. This training must begin already with the senior grades of the national schools, and, furthermore, graduates must be sent to Novosibirsk University, whereas Turkologists must also be sent to Kazan University. It seems feasible to transfer the best students from the national divisions in Tuva, Khakasiya, Gorno-Altay, Buryatiya, etc. to take the second and third courses at the NGU [Novosibirsk State University] for further training as Turkologists and Mongolists. Nowadays, moreover, when up-to-date data-processing equipment is being introduced everywhere in the academy, it would not make sense to avoid this in linguistic studies.

Thus, we need to considerably expand and strengthen all the linguistic subdivisions of Siberia and the Far East by means of young staff members. In the first place the Siberian Peoples' Languages Sector of the IIFiF of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Division constitutes the central organization within the system for studying Siberian languages. This collective, which now consists of seven persons, in addition to conducting its own research, has been assigned the tasks of coordinating the research studies of the other linguistic collectives and training personnel by means of graduate work. We must complete staffing the sector with specialists in Ob-Ugor, Samoyedic, Yenisey, and Paleo-Asiatic languages. All these languages need to be described just as much as Russian, for example, which is being done by hundreds of specialists in the country. In the future we must start to think about establishing a Siberian Peoples' Languages Institute within the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Division.

Through this newspaper we wish to direct a proposal to the USSR State Committee for Public Education to officially reduce the teaching loads at least to 400-500 hours per annum for instructors at the Siberian VUZ's who are conducting productive scientific research on these problems, of course, with the appropriate reports on their topics.

The possibilities of publications also ought to be expanded. We need to formulate a unified, comprehensive program of studying Siberia's languages, with future publication of a multivolume series of grammatical descriptions and dictionaries of these languages. It seems

evident that all measures of assistance in this matter should be rendered by party and soviet organs, as well as the Soviet Cultural Fund, along with its oblast- and republic-level subdivisions.

It is time that we finally understood that this is important not only for every nationality in our country. It is also far from being a matter of indifference for the international prestige of the Soviet Union as a multinational power which has proclaimed the principle of equality among nations and the flowering of national cultures.

#### **Moldavian as Official Language Would 'Violate Linguistic Equality'**

18000315 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA  
in Russian 1 Dec 88 p 2

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor V. Yakovlev: "A deliberated Approach Is Needed: Secure the Restructuring With Concrete Action" (Addressed to the Interdepartmental Commission for the Study of the History and Problems of Development of the Moldavian Language Under the Presidium of the MoSSR Supreme Soviet)]

[Text] There have been demands lately that Moldavian be recognized as the state language. I want to say at the outset that in the Theses "Secure the Restructuring With Concrete Action," the Moldavian Communist Party CC, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the MoSSR absolutely correctly call upon the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry and the intelligentsia "to strictly observe the principles of a deliberated, responsible policy and be guided by the Leninist dialectic method of analyzing history and reality."

#### **What do history and contemporary reality tell us?**

The principles underlying the Leninist national policy (equal rights, sovereignty and friendship of peoples) were set down in the Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People" in 1918, in the first constitutions of the Union republics in the '20s and '40s, and in the 1924 and 1936 constitutions of the USSR.

The main landmarks in the Soviet state's historical development and the socialist reforms which have occurred during that time are set down in the first part of the Preamble to the 1977 Constitution of the USSR. The fraternal friendship and cooperation of our nation's peoples have played an exceptional, creative role in the building of socialism. The unfading [eat of the Soviet people and their Armed Forces, which won a historic victory in the Great Patriotic War, was a brilliant manifestation of that friendship.

Only three out of 15 present constitutions of the Union republics (the ArSSR, the AzSSR and the GSSR), adopted in accordance with the 1977 Constitution of the USSR, contain special articles dealing with a state language.

Article 75 of the GSSR Constitution, for example, states: "Georgian is the state language of the Georgian SSR."

"The Georgian SSR exercises state concern for the all-around development of the Georgian language and supports its use in state and public agencies, cultural, educational and other establishments.

"Russian and other languages used by the population may be freely used in these agencies and establishments in the Georgian SSR. No sort of privileges or restrictions are permitted in the use of specific languages."

There are similar articles in the constitutions of the AzSSR (Article 73) and the ArSSR (Article 72). The content of these articles shows that the term "state language" is used for designating and further developing the most highly utilized language, the language used by the given republic's "indigenous" population. But no privileges are permitted for the given language, because every citizen is guaranteed the right to use his native language. It is our opinion that this term is a tribute to a tradition of many years, set forth in constitutions adopted in the '40s in the Armenian and Georgian SSRs (also in the 1922 Constitution in the Georgian GSSR).

The Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR (UkSSR), which formerly included the Moldavian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (MASSR), contains an instructive statute on national principles.

Article 19 of the 1929 Constitution of the UkSSR, for example, states the following: "Acknowledging the fact that the rights of citizens do not depend upon their racial or national origin, the Ukrainian SSR declares any form of oppression of national minorities to be totally incompatible with the republic's fundamental laws." Article 20 then defines the public functions of languages used in the UkSSR, including the MASSR.

This article states that "the languages of all nationalities residing within the Ukrainian SSR have equal rights, and every citizen, regardless of national origin, has a complete right to use his native language in his dealings with state agencies, in the state agencies' dealings with him, in all public activities and in all public life."

A statute on national policy set forth in the Constitution of the MASSR and approved at the First Moldavian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies in 1925 deserves to be looked at.

Article 9 of the Constitution states that Moldavian, Ukrainian and Russian are the most commonly used languages in the MASSR.

Article 10 of the Constitution contains a statute similar to that in Article 20 of the Constitution of the USSR, pertaining to equal rights for all languages and all nationalities residing within the MASSR. It states that every citizen of the MASSR has the right to use his native language in his dealings with state agencies and in state agencies' dealings with him, as well as at sessions of the congresses of the soviets and at other congresses, sessions and public activities.

The 1941 Constitution of the MoSSR similarly guarantees the right to use one's native language.

The present Constitution of the USSR, 1977 (Article 36) and the Constitution of the MoSSR, 1978 (Article 36), fully retained all of the previously specified guarantees of equality for citizens of the USSR and the Moldavian SSR.

Guarantees of the right to use one's native language or any language of the nation's other peoples are specified also in other articles of the constitutions of the USSR and the MoSSR, and in legislative acts. For example, this right is secured in the area of education (Article 43 of the Constitution of the MoSSR), notarial affairs (Article 9 of the 1973 Law on the State Notary Public of the USSR), the exercise of political rights (Article 44 of the 6 July 1978 Law on Elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and Article 1 of the Ukase on the Procedure for the Publication and Actuation of Laws of the USSR, passed by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 19 July 1958), the conduct of legal proceedings in the MoSSR in the Moldavian or Russian language or in the language of the majority population of the given area (Article 158 of the Constitution of the MoSSR, Article 9 of the Civil-Procedure Code of the MoSSR).

Article 17 of the MoSSR Labor Code states that "no direct or indirect restrictions on the rights or the establishment of direct or indirect advantages for employment based on sex, race, national origin or attitude toward religion is permitted." Article 4 of the MoSSR Code on Marriage and the Family establishes equal rights for citizens in family relations regardless of nationality, race or attitude toward religion. We would add that the rights of citizens of the MoSSR to enjoy all types of cultural achievements also in the native Moldavian language are guaranteed. Similar guarantees exist in all areas of the life of Soviet citizens.

All of this demonstrates that equality of languages, including the Moldavian language, is fully guaranteed by law. There can only be problems pertaining to the actual implementation of these guarantees, the elimination of which requires mobilizing the efforts of all citizens of our republic.

In our opinion, what has been stated here rules out the need to establish the Moldavian language as the state language within the republic. In addition, we need to take into account the following:

—the public functions of a state language are valid only in relations of individual citizens with state agencies, and of the latter with citizens. The right to use Moldavian or other languages in such relations, as we have already stated, is guaranteed by the constitutions of the USSR and the MoSSR and by other legislation;

—mandating the use of the Moldavian language in all areas of the vital activities of citizens would be nothing other than the establishment of direct advantages for citizens of Moldavian nationality, and this is not only contrary to the law, but it also causes irreparable harm to friendship and cooperation of Soviet citizens, to their unity;

—a state language cannot be mandatory in the area of material production, in which labor collectives of mixed nationalities work. Furthermore, it should be born in mind that the process of internationalizing life, politics, the social area, economics, culture, linguistic makeup and so forth, is presently moving forward. This internationalism has its roots in economic relations, whose participants are all of the nations and ethnic groups of the USSR. We have a single national economic complex. It provides the social and economic foundation for international unity of the Soviet nations and ethnic groups;

—a national state language of this or that republic is not acceptable in international, inter-republic relations. Only Moldavian-Russian bilingualism can provide for effective international communication in these relations.

While totally approving the Theses of the Moldavian Communist Party CC, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the MoSSR that it is necessary to "support the restructuring with concrete action," I would like to say a few words about the present, noisy campaign, which is in conflict with the Theses, of appeals and statements to the Moldavian people calling for their rejection of their native language and the Slavic script, and their adoption of the Latin alphabet.

The Theses state absolutely correctly that "the Moldavian language, independent and with equal rights, has served the Moldavian people and the population of the area for many centuries. It has its history and its future."

The history of the emergence and development of the Moldavian language has been thoroughly studied by our republic's scholars. Unfortunately, not just those who composed the "appeals," but also those who unthinkingly signed them, remain deaf to these scientifically based conclusions.

It would be appropriate here to cite certain conclusions of scientific investigations from the creative legacy of famous Moldavian writer Aleksey Matveyevich, after whom Kishinev lovers of literature and music named

their club. In his work "Elements of Church Influence in the Origin and the Historical Development of the Moldavian Language" (Aleksey Matveyevich, "Izbranoye" [Selections], Kishinev, 1988, pp 88-116), he wrote the following: "In contiguous Romania, where until relatively recently religious services were conducted with the same Moldavian church books which we use here in Bessarabia, those books have now been replaced with new ones printed in the Latin script in a new language created by philologists. The language has been distorted to the utmost. It is patterned after the literary Romanian language and is replete with Latin, Gallic and all sorts of other barbarisms of West European origin. It is perfectly unintelligible to the popular masses, of course...."

A. Matveyevich then discusses the history of the Moldavian language. He writes the following: "Science has now accurately established the fact that this language has Latin roots and is structurally similar to Italian, French and other languages. The abundance mainly of Slavic words, but also the presence of Greek and Turkish words, the number of which could boldly contend with the number of words of Latin origin, for a long time evoked strong doubts about its being a member of the Romance family. These doubts were reinforced by the widespread use of Slavic writing in Moldavia in ancient times and by the official position occupied by the Slavic language at the court of the Moldavian voivodes."

A. Matveyevich notes that, due to fate, the Moldavian language underwent a no less powerful Greek and Turkish influence. A. Matveyevich also directs attention to the fact that "as early as Bessarabia's union with Russia (1812) there was a school of philologists/Latinizers at a stage of considerable development beyond the Prut, who had begun "purifying" the language of Slavic elements and replacing them with Latin, French, Italian and other elements proceeded hand in hand with them, ultimately distorting the popular language and depriving it of its national features."

A. Matveyevich completes his thought with the conclusion that "the following are components of the Bessarabian Moldavian language: a Latin foundation and Slavic, Greek and Turkish elements. The latter appear mainly in conversational speech and are almost never encountered in church books. This is the essence of the language. Its specific features relate exclusively to popular speech and, in a narrower sense, to pronunciation. It has become so characteristic of the Moldavians that they can be immediately distinguished from Romanians."

These are the basic conclusions of our famous Moldavian writer. I hope that the contemporary "Romanianizers" of the Moldavian language will not detect in Aleksey Matveyevich's conclusions the influence of the "Stalinist era" and the impact of administration by decrees and orders. There is only one thing left to add: the fact that I am a native Moldavian; I was born and grew up here; I left for



the Great Patriotic War from here; I returned here; I live here and am devoting my labor and my life to the service of my Moldavian people here.

**Ukrainian Language Society Formed in Ternopol**  
18000465 Kiev *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* in Russian  
28 Dec 88 p 3

[Article by V. Nazarchuk, Ternopol: "Native Word: A Ukrainian Language Society Has Been Formed in Ternopol"]

[Text] "Language is the spiritual wealth of a nation. As long as a people speak their native language, said K. Ushynskiy, their nation lives."

Concern for the fate of their native language brought many of Ternopol's citizens to the assembly hall of the local pedagogical institute for a meeting to establish the Ukrainian Language Society. The oblast division of the Ukrainian Cultural Fund, the state pedagogical institute and the Ukrainian Writers' Union and bibliophile oblast organizations are the Society's organizers and founders. "Our Society was founded in consideration of a large number of requests within the community", says Professor R.T. Gromyak, chairman of the Society's council, writer and head of the pedagogical institute's department of Ukrainian literature, who was elected to chairmanship at the meeting. "Indeed, currently it is necessary for us to promote in every possible way broadening of the spheres within which the native language is used and to imbue the language with new life. But this must be done carefully, without excessive emotion, depending on creative initiative and the voluntary cooperation of a wide section of the community; it must be done in a manner affirming Ukrainian-Russian bilingualism".

The statutes confirmed by the meeting state in part that the Society, interacting with state and trade union organs, socio-political and other organizations, will be guided in its work by the principles of socialist internationalism and Soviet patriotism, self-government, democracy and glasnost; it will operate on the basis of socialist pluralism.

**Charges Brought Against Leaders of BSSR's Martyrolog Society**  
18120051 Moscow *MOSCOW NEWS* in English  
No 52, 1-8 Jan 89 p 13

[Article by Alexander Mostovshchikov: "Belated Trials"]

[Text] Why the head of Byelorussia's Martyrolog, an unofficial historical society, was not tried on December 7 in Minsk and why related trial was postponed in Mogilev

The judge's chambers were cramped and the monologue terse. After Zenon Poznyak, and various interested spectators—some of whom had come to write about or film this event—had squeezed into the room, Valentina Kulik read out the ruling. Inasmuch as Poznyak had filed

a complaint with Byelorussia's Procurator's Office against the militia with reference to events that took place on October 30 (Poznyak was not the only one to file) and inasmuch as he had disagreed with the protocol (as did several others), the Procurator's Office had requested the records for Case No K-23.

The thin file, sent from the Pervomaisky District People's Court of Minsk, said that citizen Poznyak Z. S. had tried to organize an unsanctioned meeting. The complaints had not yet been checked by the Procurator's Office and so the question of Poznyak's violation of Byelorussia's Code "On Administrative Transgressions" could not be examined in court that day, December 7.

A few minutes later this news reached the people waiting outside in front of the court building. All of them took an interest in this tall, confident man respected by many people in Byelorussia....

Kuropaty, near Minsk, is overgrown with a joyless postwar coniferous forest. Articles, photographs, reports and TV stories have told what have happened here. The first to tell was Zenon Poznyak, an archaeologist, art critic and public figure, with engineer designer Yevgeny Shmygalyov.

From press reports many people know about an aborted meeting on October 30—Remembrance Day (Dzyady). They know it was dispersed and that some participants on the field not far from Kuropaty listened to Martyrolog's leaders, including Zenon Poznyak, chairman of its public council. The militia broke up the wood-be meeting. Poznyak was not detained. And now comes this belated trial....

Yefim Lopushin, Poznyak's lawyer, and I are leafing through extracts from the case records.

"There is much in them that surprises me," the lawyer says. "Immediately after the lamentable events of October 30 the detainees were called to administrative responsibility. Studying these events, the commission of the Presidium of Byelorussia's Supreme Soviet noted that the incident could have been avoided, that the leaders of executive committees had taken a formal approach to examining the Tuteishiya association's requests to hold the meeting. These requests didn't have to be rejected. A different time and place could have been found. The sponsors, for their part, should have shown respect for the law. More than two weeks after the events, on November 15, a protocol suddenly appeared. It included militia major's report and barely legible xeroxed copies of witnesses' explanations. What is Poznyak accused of? He tried to organize a meeting. But even if he tried, he didn't actually organize it. It is not clear how the attempt was manifested. 'Carried out active agitation among spontaneously assembled people.' It means that it isn't he who assembled them. What kind of

agitation work did he carry out? Perhaps he should be thanked for this instead of being put on trial? The commission stressed that Byelorussia's Martyrolog was not a sponsor."

"This is really so," says Poznyak. "But I understood that despite the City Soviet Executive Committee's interdiction people would attend the meeting-requiem. One of Martyrolog's aims is to find victims of Stalin's repressions. And it was clear that people would like to pay homage to their memory. In that situation I had to have a clear idea of what turn the events would take. At the cemetery I realized that a conflict with the militia might be provoked and things might come to blows. Militiamen selectively grabbed people, mostly intellectuals, out of the crowd. I also got my share: they started twisting my arms and a shortish militiaman sprayed my face with tear gas. When I came to, I tried to persuade those around me: 'Be wise, don't give in to provocations, keep calm, size up the situation.' But militiamen attacked the crowd, people were knocked off their feet and dragged along. To avoid the worst, I suggested going to Kuro-pathy. But who could hear me in the crowd? If people went there it means that common sense prevailed...."

What turn would events take? Georgi Tarnavsky, Byelorussia's Procurator, told me that he considered that Poznyak's and other people's complaints had not been thoroughly checked and so had requested case records. The order went from top to bottom, and now the question will be studied by the City Procurator's Office, Nikolai Kupriyanov, head of the General Supervision Department of Byelorussia's Procurator's Office, and by Georgi Tarnavsky.

"If the law has been violated, I shall demand that violations be eliminated," said Tarnavsky. "If I see no violations, then the trial will be held."

This is a sign of the times as is the fact that not one militiaman was sent to the court building. After people heard that the case had been adjourned, they began to disperse. I asked some of them what had brought them there. Maya Kleshtornaya, whose father, a well-known Byelorussian poet, was shot in the 1930s while she and her mother went through camps and exile. Vasily Syomukha, who translated Goethe's "Faust" into Byelorussian, and Vladimir Krukovsky, a poster painter who is Poznyak's deputy in Martyrolog. Later I spoke to poet Rygor Borodulin. All of them said Poznyak was an outstanding citizen, and that to try him would be unfair.

A few interviews don't equal public opinion. But Minsk citizens' keen interest in Poznyak's trial cannot be disregarded.

MN has consistently covered developments in Byelorussia—their negative and positive aspects. Recently the campaign in the Byelorussian press denigrating unofficial associations and their leaders has subsided. Professionals were given a chance to state conflicting points of

view. but—hark!—familiar headlines again flashed in the regional newspaper MOGILEVSKAYA PRAVDA (in Byelorussian): "Ambitions are no argument", "Cui bono?", "Need to give due assessment", "Uninvited guests". Articles and notes are again filled with memorable locutions like "we don't go their way" or "democracy must be built with clean hands", different unofficial associations are being lumped together. Take the article entitled "Front. Against whom?"

What happened in Mogilev? What danger jeopardizes social life in this regional centre? For many years during her travels Tamara Romankova, a teacher of the Mogilev cultural-educational school, collected information about Stalin's repressions. Her interest and that of others in Byelorussia's Martyrolog society can well be understood. On November 27, they decided to set up a regional branch of this unofficial organization. They invited former victims of the repressions and guests from Minsk, including Poznyak. Despite an agreement with the superintendent of the hostel of the Volodarsky clothes factory, they were not allowed to gather there. Then Romankova suggested that they move to the school's subsidiary where she was teaching physics. She says the school's headmaster agreed over the phone. He says he did not give any permission. I have no reason to disbelieve either one. A telephone conversation is not a document....

On that day, November 27, when the peaceful discussion was drawing to a close, the subsidiary's building was entered by the school's headmaster, the secretary of the Party bureau, a captain of the militia and a vice-chairman of the district executive committee. They demanded that the meeting be stopped and the names of those present be taken. Then they swapped wrath for grace and allowed the founding conference to go on. As a result, the Mogilev branch of Byelorussia's Martyrolog was headed by Valentin Yermolovich, Honoured Worker in Culture of Byelorussia, who is highly esteemed in the Republic. Speakers stressed the need to work closely with the Regional Party Committee.

Passions reached a boil after the meeting. The papers fanned the flame. The militia went to the school and suggested that Romankova sign a protocol on her violating the Code "On Administrative Transgressions".

Romankova is a difficult and emotional person, sometimes even irksome. But I think she acts out of noble considerations. On two occasions at school she refused to sign a standard protocol which provided no space where she could explain her disagreement. On the third occasion militia officers Lieutenant-Colonel Yuri Yershov and Captain Alexander Zolotukhin invited witnesses—school workers—and went into the classroom. The lesson was about to end, the students were told to go out, but Romankova, not knowing what might happen, asked them to stay. Zolotukhin started reading the protocol aloud. It is hard to say what motivated Romankova when

she headed for the exit—probably she did not want that paper to be read in the presence of the students. But her way was blocked by Yuri Yershov.

Romankova claims that the lieutenant-colonel caught her by her arm, twisted it and pushed her. Yuri Yershov, to whom I spoke, flatly denies this. But one student, Oleg Busel, said into my dictophone that Romankova's arm was twisted and she herself was pushed. We weren't able to finish our conversation. The student was quickly called out and a minute later he was already standing by the headmaster's office—one can easily guess what for. In the headmaster's office, two smart girls briskly reported that there had been no violence. Yet other students told me that on that day they had seen their teacher's blue arm.

Another curious fact: when I mentioned Romankova's name at the school entrance the doorwoman snapped out—"No one is allowed to see her."

On Monday, December 11, Romankova's trial was deferred at her request: she wanted to study the materials, invite her lawyer and suggested inviting witnesses. The charge against her is that she didn't submit a preliminary application to hold the meeting. But was such an application necessary in this situation? The well-known decree on responsibility for violating the established order of organizing and conducting rallies, meetings, street processions and demonstrations, adopted in all the Republics must, on the one hand, guarantee citizens' constitutional rights and, on the other, guarantee that this right is not accompanied by violations of public order. But what kind of threat to order is it if 38 persons meet in a room to discuss their affairs? Especially since their purpose was to set up a branch of an already existing unofficial public organization pursuing noble objectives. Romankova has already been strictly reprimanded for unsanctioned use of school premises (that damned telephone!). A personal case will be investigated by her Party organization. And now also a trial. Well, but can five or ten persons come together without sending an application in advance to the district executive committee?

The Regional Party Committee has mapped out a programme for joint work with the local branch of Byelorussia's Martyrolog. I had a long discussion with Larisa Pakush, Secretary of the Regional Party Committee. We did not see eye to eye on everything, but it was clear that steps towards a half-way house were being taken. Mutual injuries were being smoothed out, the question was being decided of allocating a premise of its own to the society, giving it space in local newspapers, inviting it to the discussion club, and helping collect data on the victims of the repression years.

It is possible to take a different attitude to the above mentioned events in Minsk and Mogilev. But it is perfectly obvious that they are a result of the far from simple processes taking place in the development of

perestroika. People want change, they want the pulse of social life to beat in a new way. But many are scared by this novelty. It disturbs the work of those who are responsible for decision making and these decisions are not always well considered. This is how resistance to change arises and behind it one often detects a yearning for the past.

Of course, the situation in one city or region doesn't make a national forecast. But whereto will the balance tip in Minsk and Mogilev?

#### **Newspaper Conducts Survey on 1933 Ukrainian Famine**

18110023a Kiev *SILSKI VISTI* in Ukrainian  
9 Dec 88 p 4

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor S. Kulchytsky: "'1933: The Famine': We Invite Creation of a Memorial Book"]

[Text] At the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference B. I. Oliynyk, secretary of the board of the Ukrainian SSS Union of Writers, proposed that the causes of the 1933 famine, which took the lives of millions of Ukrainians, be explained and that the names of those to blame for this tragedy be named. This proposal is now being implemented. An editorial board has been formed for a large memorial book entitled "33-y: holod" [1933: The Famine], which is to consist of the testimony of direct participants in and eyewitnesses to the tragic events, archival documents, and materials from the press. The editorial board includes both writers and scholars from the Institute of Party History attached to the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History, and Kiev University. Experienced professional historians are working on the documents and recollections. The team of authors is headed by writer V. A. Manyak.

Of course we would want the memorial book to contain a great deal of archival documents capable of casting a strong light on the "blank spot" in the history of Soviet society which the year 1933 has been for more than half a century now. We historians are aware, however, that there is little documentary evidence. There are reasons for this.

When the famine was approaching the alarm should have been sounded, and the public, both in this country and abroad, should have been mobilized to help the peasants. There was experience in state-organized efforts to combat famine: in 1921, when agricultural production, already adversely affected by the Civil War, was hit by an unprecedented drought, the Soviet Government, under the direction of V. I. Lenin, made every effort to save the lives of millions of peasants along the Volga and in the southern rayons of the Ukraine. As regards efforts to combat the famine of 1933, however, glasnost would



have meant acknowledging the fact of economic catastrophe which ended Stalin's experiment with meeting the targets of the five-year plan in three years.

Stalin chose another path—a cowardly and criminal hush-up of the catastrophic situation in the village. In January 1933, when there was still time to act, he announced from the speaker's stand at a combined plenary session of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the All-Union Communist Party (of Bolsheviks) ahead-of-schedule fulfillment of the First Five-Year Plan (although this was in no way in conformity with reality), and added: "We have indisputably achieved a situation where the material status of workers and peasants is improving year by year. Only inveterate enemies of Soviet rule could have any doubts about this."

Thus the general secretary issued an unequivocal directive to treat the famine as a nonexistent phenomenon. The kolkhoz farmers from whom food stocks were taken in the course of grain procurement were left in the lurch. In addition, grain procurement in the famine-struck Ukraine, on the insistent demand of Stalin and under the direct supervision of Molotov and Kaganovich, continued even in the first 10 days of February 1933.

As he reviews newspapers or archival documents, the historian constantly comes across mention of "kulak sabotage" of grain procurement activities. In particular, in the newspapers of that time one can find a great many reports of confiscation of grain discovered during the conduct of searches, and confiscation of other food supplies if the procurement-shortfall peasant farmers had no grain. But nowhere do we find any information about the food situation of the peasants. For example, documents of the Ukrainian SSR People's Commissariat of Agriculture cite many instances of foundlings abandoned by peasants in cities and towns in hopes that they would be cared for, talk about the untended crops of kolkhoz farmers who had died of starvation, and about the recruitment of "dopryselntsi" (bureaucratic jargon

term for new settlers in villages the inhabitants of which had died or had been dispersed). But we do not encounter the word "holod" [hunger, starvation, famine]. This terminological taboo was maintained even in the secret documents of party agencies at every level. Of course nobody was afraid that information which was known to everybody would leak out. There was quite another reason for this taboo: the subject of famine, hunger and starvation was not to be discussed at party meetings or party committee plenary sessions.

It is precisely for this reason that we must rely primarily on the testimony of eyewitnesses in creating a memorial book. Through the newspaper *SILSKI VISTI* we are appealing to the public at large to take part in writing this bitter but extremely necessary historical document. The editorial board is particularly interested in information on the following:

so-called sabotage of grain procurement by party workers and economic administrators (there is a published statement by Stalin to the effect that the majority of rural Communists were sabotaging food distribution efforts);

repressive measures against managers and rank-and-file kolkhoz farmers for failing to meet grain procurement quotas;

forms of noncentralized assistance to famine victims (at the republic, oblast, rayon, and kolkhoz levels);

the fate of villages placed on the "black list";

the number of persons who died of starvation in the villages;

urban assistance in the 1933 spring planting;

general recollections of eyewitnesses.

Please send letters to the newspaper offices or to the following address: 252054, Kiev 54, ulitsa Chkalova 52, apartment 38, Volodymyr Antonovych Manyak.

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

#### SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

28 Feb 1989